THE Lutheran Quarterly

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

lume VI MAY, 1954 Number 2

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume VI MAY, 1954 Number 2

CONTENTS

OUR CHRISTIAN TASK IN INDIA ..... *Robert Paul Roth* 91

LUTHERANISM IN FRANCE ..... *René Blanc* 102

THE DANISH INNER MISSION, 1853-1953 ..... *Stinus S. Loft* 113

A CHRISTOLOGY OF FUNCTION ..... *Joseph Sittler* 122

HISTORY AS YOU LIKE IT ..... *Lloyd M. Wallick* 132

LET MAN BE MAN ..... *Otto W. Heick* 143

NOTES AND STUDIES

Paul's Use of "Wrath of God" ..... *J. Benjamin Bedenbaugh* 154
The Date of Crucifixion in the Synoptics and John ..... *Uuras Saarnivaara* 157
Our So-called Houses of Prayer ..... *Granger Westberg* 160

LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

Denmark: Discussion of Eternal Life and Immortality ..... *J. Knudsen* 164
Norway: Debate about Hell ..... *Iver Iversen* 165
Germany: Church and State; Bultmann's Demythologization; Inter-Church Relations; Faith and Life ..... *E. Theodore Bachmann* 170
U. S. A.: Microfilms of American Lutheranism ..... *Theodore G. Tappert* 176

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Index to Religious Periodical Literature (Raymond P. Morris) 178
Welch, *In His Name* (James J. Raun) 178
Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma und Mythos* (Paul Leo) 180
Müller and Blankenburg, eds., *Leiturgia I* (Luther D. Reed) 182
Kjöllerström, *Biskopstillsättningen i Sverige* (O. N. Olson) 183
Klamroth, *Lutherischer Glaube im Denken der Gegenwart* (O. W. Heick) 184
Ellis, *Christian Stewardship and Church Finance* (H. H. Bagger) 184

CONTRIBUTORS

Robert Paul Roth is professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Southern Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina.

René Blanc, a clergyman of the Lutheran Church in France, prepared an account of Lutheranism in his native country especially for the information of Americans, and it was translated into English by Sheldon Torgerson, a missionary of the Lutheran Free Church who is studying in France in preparation for service in Madagascar.

Stinus S. Loft is a pastor of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Kennard, Nebraska.

Joseph Sittler is professor of Systematic Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Illinois.

Lloyd M. Wallick is pastor of Grace Lutheran Church in Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania.

Otto W. Heick is professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Seminary of Canada, Waterloo, Ontario.

J. Benjamin Bedenbaugh is instructor in Homiletics and Liturgics in the Southern Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina.

Uuras Saarnivaara, until recently professor of theology at Suomi Seminary, Hancock, Michigan, has assumed an editorial post in Finland.

Granger Westberg is a member of the Federated Faculty of the University of Chicago.

Reporters on "Life and Thought in World Lutheranism" in this number are Johannes Knudsen, dean of Grand View Theological Seminary in Des Moines, Iowa; Iver Iversen, professor of Church History in Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota; and E. Theodore Bachmann, professor of Church History in the Pacific Lutheran Seminary, Berkeley, California.

Among the reviewers in this issue are H. H. Bagger, president of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Otto W. Heick; Paul Leo, professor of the New Testament in Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa; Raymond P. Morris, librarian of the Divinity School of Yale University; Oscar N. Olson, historian of the Augustana Lutheran Church, Rock Island, Illinois; James J. Raun, professor of Systematic Theology in Northwestern Lutheran Seminary, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Luther D. Reed, president emeritus of the Philadelphia Seminary.

Our Christian Task in India

By Robert Paul Roth

SIGMUND FREUD wrote a book which he entitled *The Future of an Illusion*. The illusion was religion, and according to the prophet of psychoanalysis the future of religion is dark. The essence of Hinduism is *Maya,* which means illusion. If Freud had been referring only to Hinduism, he might have had a good case, for Hinduism is based on a deception, an escape, an illusory excursion into a mystic realm of make-believe. In contrast, we may fairly say that Christianity is real, historical, factual; and its proof is in the dynamic effect it has upon human life and history.

I shall attempt to analyze the workings of what is called Western civilization, tracing its heritage where possible to Christian origins, and contrasting its genius with the directive force behind Hindu society. When this analytical study is completed, I shall attempt an answer to the question, What, then, is the Christian task in India? In short, I shall define what we in the West have to give, contrast it with what the Hindus already have in their own culture, and proceed to show what we can do for India in the future. The method of analysis which I shall employ is that of dialectics.

Before taking up the analysis of Western society, let me say a word about the basic assumption from which this paper proceeds. Here, too, we are concerned with dialectics; the fundamental opposition between quietism and activism in the Christian life. For the most part continental European Christianity has been quietistic for the past century, while American Christianity has been activistic. The ecumenical and missionary conferences at Edinburgh, Lausanne, and Madras, predominantly influenced by continental orthodoxy, consistently defined the Christian task to be one of preaching the Gospel without regard for the social uplift of the people. Religion was considered a matter of the spirit, and if the spirit raised the body, it would do so in its own good time and in its own way. There was a declared aversion to foisting Western civilization upon the Orient. It was common to hear the super-

ficial materialism of the West contrasted with the profound spiritualism of the East. Humanitarian activism and the Social Gospel which characterized the American churches were decried as the secularization of Christianity.

It is my contention that both quietism and activism are false expressions of the Gospel. The quietism of Europe, in which preachers talk piously of faith and the soul and leave politics and economics entirely to the state, has been recently indicted with the blood of millions. The activism of America, in which preachers build social centers with bowling alleys and billiard tables but forget the lonely Galilean bleeding on his cross, has produced a society which is all belly but no head.

Without debating the point further, therefore, I must simply state that my thesis assumes that it is the business of the Christian man to work in this world without being of it. Quietism is just as evil as Maya, and in fact we may say that it is the Christian expression of the idealistic error of illusion. Activism confuses the means to happiness with the ultimate purpose in life, and when it is carried to its ultimate conclusion one is left with a bottomless abyss of meaninglessness. The Christian man must be active in lifting society, building roads, bridges, hospitals, schools, scientific laboratories, training technicians, creating machines, developing the arts in order that there might be beauty and comfort in the world. This is the fulfillment of the vocation of love to which every Christian is called, and as we shall see, such a call must inevitably work a change in any society with which it comes in contact. It is not enough to say simply that the Gospel will of itself work that change; this is what the quietists of Germany thought until Hitler stopped even the preaching of the Word. Rather we must proclaim that God's will shall be effective in every walk of life, and that every decision, every activity of man, Christian or non-Christian, must be repeatedly subjected to the criticism of the Christian conscience. We must not only preach the Gospel to save souls; we must also practice the Gospel to save society. As Niebuhr has said, "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary."

In place of the two extremes of quietism and activism, therefore, I propose a dynamic, working Christianity in which every activity derives from and goes back to Christ. The genius of such a society is freedom under God with individual responsibility for constant self-

correction. If we quietly sit by sweetly whispering to one another about the salvation of our souls, we shall become responsible for allowing tyranny to grip the masses, and soon there will not be any souls left to save. The awful truth is that you cannot preach the Gospel to a dead man lying on a battlefield or burning in a concentration camp! Democracy is therefore necessary as a check, a criticism, a conscience, lest man out of dread lose his freedom and become a slave, or this same man, out of pride, run away with his freedom and destroy himself.

The Analysis of Western Society

The crisis of Western man has become articulated in the fundamental cleavage between the orders of collectivism and individualism. There is a battle of ideologies in which victimized sinners are tossed mercilessly between the vicious horns of a false dilemma. On the one hand, we are asked to follow an ideology of individualism in which basic evil is found to be seated in government control and the solution or deliverance from evil is sought in absolute freedom from interference by government in economic and social life. On the other hand, we are asked to follow an ideology of collectivism in which basic evil is found in the private ownership of property and deliverance from evil is sought in an inevitable class struggle with wanton appeal to violence.

In both cases evil is said to be rooted in an institution, and from this it follows logically that the deliverance from social ills is a simple matter of eradicating the offending institution. The only difference seems to be in the identifying of the institution which is the source of trouble. The classical liberals say that government is wicked, and the Communists say that property is wicked; and therefore while the former want a minimum of government, the latter want a maximum.

Christianity, confronted with this dilemma, says the dilemma is false because both horns have a superficial appreciation of evil, and therefore both ideologies seek solution in the wrong direction. Evil is not rooted in any institution, neither property nor government, but evil is fundamental to the sinful nature of man. Institutions belong to the created order of things; they are of God, and they are no more evil than a rock or a tree or any other part of God's creation. But they are used by men, and in so far as they are misused or abused, they become instruments of man's evil design.

In the first place, if private property is the root of evil, government ownership and control of property and the forces of production should logically eliminate poverty and injustice; but the facts of human experience testify against this thesis, for in every case of government management the oligarchy in power rules like a small mob while penury, tyranny, and gangsterism run rampant.

In the second place, if government is the cause of all evil, then, logically, complete relaxation of controls should breed a healthy society; but we know that it is precisely the healthy liberal society that inevitably succumbs in a run-away inflation. We do better not to trust the logic of social theories; we will diagnose the case and prescribe the remedy more successfully if we go to the facts as they are lived in history, and as they stand under both the judgment and the forgiveness of the Cross.

Such examination reveals that man is a limited being with certain peculiar qualities of freedom. He lives in a variety of created orders, such as the state, the market place, the family, the place of worship, none of which he can transcend, but all of which he not only can but must improve. These orders are good in the sense that all God's creation is good, but morally they are neither good nor bad. Man alone has that possibility and responsibility.

In our Western world, due to the influence of Christianity working as a leaven in history, we have developed these orders along a peculiar line of progress which has recently been challenged by the ideology of Communism. In the state we have democracy, in the market place we have free enterprise, in the family we have a fraternal system which is neither patriarchal nor matriarchal, in science and education we have a methodology of critical experimentation. I believe that all of these social processes are indebted to the Christian directive of love and forgiveness, and I shall endeavor to prove it by translating our classical Christian vocabulary into modern parlance.

The unique and special contribution which the revelation of Jesus Christ gives to the world is the message of the forgiveness of sins. No other religion has anything to say about such a benevolent divine act. Forgiveness deals primarily with a man's status before God and the destiny of his soul in eternity, but from the beginning, according to the teachings of Jesus and the first apostles, forgiveness also has its dynamic effect upon the life of man in history. Essentially forgiveness is an individual matter in which a man examines himself, confesses his guilt,

repents, and gratefully accepts in faith the second chance offered to him by the grace of God. If this is applied to the vocation of man in every walk of life, it means that as a politician he must examine himself before the bar of the will of God, admit his error, and try again with the new power which comes alone from Christ; as a scientist he must test every conclusion in the crucible of hard fact and accept nothing but the truth in his experimentation; as a businessman be must likewise examine his affairs and correct them to fit the will of God. And yet this method is precisely what we hold up as the ideal in democratic government, free enterprise, and scientific method. In every case the spirit is one of self-correction; in every case freedom is guaranteed on the condition of individual responsibility for the admission of error. In the state such criticism is provided for by repeated popular elections; in the market place, by open competition; in the laboratory, by testing hypotheses on the basis of empirical results; in the family, by constant informal forums.

In short, the whole of Christian society is directed by the genius of freedom under God with the responsibility for self-correction, or what we call, in theological language, repentance and the forgiveness of sins. In the institution known as the Roman Catholic Church, however, it must be said that such a genius is neither the ideal nor the practice. Here, as in Communism, the formidable challenger of the Christian way of life, freedom, is sacrificed for the sake of absolute, totalitarian control of the lives of its members, and criticism is ruled out as deleterious to the welfare of the institution. Both Roman Catholicism and Communism maintain the infallibility of their leaders, both engage in a scheme of controlled propaganda and a censored press, and neither can admit the possibility of error in the decisions of its councils. It is not surprising that two such extreme forms of totalitarianism find themselves in bitter enmity with each other.

The Analysis of Hindu Society

In the dialectical oscillation between individualism and collectivism, it is true, Christianity leans in the direction of individualism because nothing is more dear to the Christian man than his personal liberty under God; but it must always be remembered that this freedom is not license; it is *under God* and it is therefore responsible to every man. This is what Luther meant when he said: "The Christian man is the

most free lord of all, subject to no one; and the Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, subject to every one."

But Hinduism, by contrast, leans heavily in the direction of collectivism because both the ideal and the practice of Hindu society give no room to the individual for self-expression. The genius of Hinduism is the collective absorption of the individual under the aegis of a divine determinism. All the hard facts of life, the testable impressions of our senses, are cast into the oblivion of Maya, and the man who can conquer and put aside his senses is considered a saint among saints. At the time of the death of Mahatma Gandhi the question was often asked whether he had fully conquered his senses and had risen above them to the realm of holiness. If he had, he was obviously a saint according to the Indian mind. But we may well wonder why a man should conquer his senses. What a pagan conception this is! Consider what our life would be if we stopped all efforts in art, music, the sciences, industry—all of which depend upon the proper development of sense appreciation. Is it better for a man to build a bridge and a dam to provide electric power for his community, or is it better for him to sit quietly in the lotus position like Lord Buddha contemplating his navel or turning a spinning wheel? I think only those who are afraid of life will accept the latter of these alternatives. And I think it is a basic fear and dread which has led the Hindu people to seek an escape from the realities of this life by erecting a theology of Maya. Fear, too, has led to the concomitant resultant of a social structure of caste in which freedom is sacrificed for security. But God did not make us to escape from this world; he created us in order that we might in turn create in his image. This is what it means to love our neighbor.

The whole Hindu structure is based upon the fundamental rock of ancestor worship. In the ancient Vedic religion the Indians worshiped nature deities such as Indra, Surya, Ushas, Rudra, Soma, Ahi, and the Maruts, and in those days there was no caste, no child marriage, no child widow or enforced widowhood, no *suttee,* no *zenana.* The people were filled with the exuberance of youth, with a love for life with all its dangers and opportunities. Then fear took hold of the people. Perhaps it was a fear of death, but more likely it was an abysmal dread of life. It was believed that the dead are released from the tribulation of this world and are permitted to enter a heaven which is devoid of pain and sorrow. The spirit must be dissociated from the body by burning,

and thereafter it must be fed with rice, milk, and honey so that it can grow a new body.

This belief gave rise to the ceremony of *shraddha* or ancestor worship of the *pitris,* the fathers. Since the dead father cannot perform the rite himself, he is dependent upon his son to offer *pinda,* the little cake or ball of rice, and therefore it became a matter essential to life eternal for every father to have a son who could provide him with heavenly food. Like the gods, the dead spirits have tremendous power and must be appeased regularly.

From ancestor worship the chief principles of the Hindu family system have arisen. First of all, every man must marry in order to beget a son. This led to the complete subjugation of woman, for she became a mere instrument in the sacrament of son-begetting. A patriarchal system arose in which women were secluded in *purdah,* denied the right to eat with their husbands, denied education, and reduced to the level of a chattel. Since sons were desired it became common for families to expose unwanted little girls on the mountain sides. Polygamy was the next step in this patriarchal development since a man's authority and wealth were measured by the number of his wives, and the more wives he had, the more sons he could produce. The fanatical desire for sons introduced the brutal custom of marrying off young girls before the age of puberty so as not to lose a single opportunity for producing a son. If the child were married after puberty, some time might elapse during which a son could have been born, and this was considered a sinful waste and an unforgivable breach of duty.

Just as the dead spirit must be fed by his son, so also the husband must be served by his wife while he lives in his heavenly abode. Widow remarriage is prohibited, therefore, since the Hindu women must marry for this world and the next. Hence *suttee,* or widow burning, became common as an expression of loyalty and devotion on the part of the widow to serve the needs of her husband. Today widows are no longer burned, but instead they are condemned to perpetual mourning and austerity. They are not allowed to remarry, they are stripped of their jewelry, shorn of their hair, permitted only a borderless *sari,* and condemned to be slaves in the house of their husband's relatives.

If the individual is completely lost and absorbed in the joint family system, it is easy to see how the communal orders of the Panchayat village system and the caste structure could evolve. Caste is usually ex-

plained by both Hindu and Western sociologists as a purely social order having little or no relation to the religion of India, but I believe it can be shown that the Hindu preoccupation with the salvation of the soul for the next world not only made possible the conditions under which caste could develop but also produced infrangible sanctions which have made the breakdown of caste impossible. With ancestor worship and the joint family system the individual was destroyed. Conditions thus being ripe, the next step was to make society secure by setting up vocational brackets. So far there is nothing unusual in such a process: the Chinese also had ancestor worship and a joint family system, and furthermore in the *Analects* of Confucius we find the same type of social stratification. In Plato's *Republic* society is divided into philosopher-kings, warriors, and artisans and merchants within the citizenry. Slaves and barbarians are on the outside. This system sounds suspiciously like the Indian orders of Brahmin priests and teachers, Kshatriya warriors, Vaisya merchants among the upper castes, and Sudras and Panchamas among the aborigines. The Platonic republic, moreover, found actual expression in the medieval feudal system of Europe in which the church provided the first estate, the knights comprised the second estate, and the freemen were the third, while serfs bound to the land corresponded to Plato's slaves and India's untouchables.

While the social aspects of Indian caste are not unique, the religious aspects are peculiar to Hinduism, and for this reason India was never able to grow out of this petrifying system. China was blessed with an amazing pragmatism and this-worldly bent of mind, and although she was never able to rescue the individual she never put a religious sanction on any social order. Europe had the advantage of the criticism of the Gospel, and with this franchise both the individual and the social order were liberated. But India with her religion of Karma and Maya became stultified in a morass of confusing illusions. According to Karma every deed has its retribution; there is no possibility of the forgiveness of sins, there is no possibility of a second chance to improve one's condition. According to Maya every sensible fact in this world is unreal; there is no incentive to change or progress, there is no possibility of life-fulfillment or happiness in this world.

In brief, Hinduism destroys personal freedom, absorbs the individual in a mystic realm of airy nothingness, and stultifies progress with

its petrified vocational stratification. It follows no logic with consistency, but is the product of a psychology of fear, a psychosis not unlike that of Communism, which is also a collectivistic destruction of freedom for the sake of security. Indeed, one can say the same of Hinduism in practice as Churchill said of Communism: "It is a riddle inside of a mystery and wrapped up in an enigma!"

The Christian Task in India

What, then, is the obligation of the Christian missionary in India? From my analysis of the two systems of social order it is clear that the impact of Christianity upon Hinduism is the impact of responsible individual freedom upon irresponsible collectivistic slavery. The native collectivism of Hinduism makes Indian society dangerously ripe for Communism, the most modern pagan challenger of the Christian way of life. It is an easy step from the Zemindari feudal economy to the Communist police state. It is clearly, therefore, not a simple matter of converting eager souls from a dying culture to the living dynamism of Christianity; it is a last ditch struggle with a formidable external competitor, a race against time to see whether Christianity or Communism will capture the soul of India.

Our task as Christians is to bring the forces of individual freedom to birth among the coolies, the kisans, the ryots, the sweepers, the zemindars, the artisans, the teachers, and even among the Maharajas. We must be careful to steer our course between the Charybdis of activism and the Scylla of quietism, while all the time avoiding like the plague the sirens of both an irresponsible individualism and an enslaving collectivism. We can do this only by bringing Christ personally to the individual and concomitantly bringing society as a whole to Christ. It means that we must make as many talented men and women as possible acquainted with our Christian society, training them in America if possible, and encouraging them to return to India as a leaven among the pagans. It is a mistake to set them apart from the Hindu community and "protect" them from the temptations of idolatry; we must rather send them forth, strong in the faith, and let them become leaders by virtue of their special training. It means, secondly, that we must extend our propagation of the faith among the higher castes, not only among Sudras, but also among the Vaisyas, Kshatriyas, and Brahmins. We must make our Christian voice heard in the realms of politics and

economics, offering a positive alternative to the Communist promise of public ownership of the land by force of violence. Christianity is conscience bound to destroy the feudal control of the zemindars and to bring a more equitable distribution of the forces of production; but on the other hand, Christianity cannot tolerate the infringement of the rights of individual freedom. Economic and political reform must therefore be encouraged along peaceful, democratic paths. As Niebuhr said, because of man's capacity for both justice and injustice, this program is not only possible but necessary, for if men resort to violence in this stage of human history, the outcome will be a decisive defeat not for one side or the other but for the whole human enterprise.

Our task, then, is to activate individual Christian Indians to create a free, responsible society, to liberate India from ancient customs, superstitions, and caste tyranny, and to develop among the people a genuine desire to progress. These things can be accomplished only when the superstition of ancestor worship is rooted out and the dreadful concept of Maya is overcome. The fear of the power of the supernatural world over the natural has gripped India with fetters so strong that it seems hopeless to attempt to release her; but until the individual knows that his life on this earth has a specific purpose which he himself must fulfill and which is not determined by a former existence in the wheel of Karma, there will be no freedom and no fulfillment of human destiny in India. And likewise until the individual Indian is delivered from his fear of the illusory character (Maya) of this world and his life in it, he will not apply himself to any purposeful task in society. In the meantime Hinduism leaves his soul empty and degraded, and Communism offers his body bread and circuses. Christianity must not fail at this critical moment in history to provide the starving Indian with both the physical wealth of social betterment and the spiritual riches of the forgiveness of sins and fellowship with our Lord Jesus Christ.

To make the problem even more complicated, there is an upsurge of nationalism fostered chiefly by the semi-educated classes of India. Indians paradoxically love the gadgets of Western industrialism, yet they take great pride in their Oriental spiritualism. According to the various degrees of nationalism, Indians will resist the encroachment of the West, greater in some areas than in others. While radios and jeeps can easily penetrate their culture of tom-toms and ox carts, monogamy and social justice meet with stubborn resistance. The difficulty we now

face in securing visas for evangelistic missionaries is a case in point. Medical men, on the other hand, are quite welcome. We know that the blessings of modern medicine are fruits of the Christian Gospel; Indians want the fruits but they care nothing for the tree that produced them.

Perhaps the solution to this problem is to send doctors who will preach, if not in a formal way, at least in every informal way open to them. Every technician who goes, every employee of secular enterprises, will have to be an ambassador of Christ. There is no stopping history. Our Christian culture will either charm the Orientals and attract them into the body of Christ, or we will be stopped by them. The result of the latter will be bitter conflict, a preview of which we have already seen in the war with China over Korea.

Our task in India, then, is the complex problem of killing the fear of Hindu Maya, crossing the stumbling block of a resurgent nationalism, competing with an aggressive communism, and planting a virile Christianity which will answer both the physical and spiritual needs of the Oriental world. If our sociological analysis of our Christian culture is true, the accomplishment of our task in bringing India within the fold of Christendom will depend upon whether our government, our business agents, our educators, and our technicians will bring the vine of Christ along with the fruits as they confront their Oriental brothers.

Lutheranism in France

By René Blanc[1]

THE teachings of Martin Luther found an echo in France in the early decades of the sixteenth century. John Calvin had been a "Lutheran" before becoming a "Calvinist!" People in France who were then looking for a reform of the church turned to Wittenberg with new hope, and the first martyrs of the Evangelical faith in France were considered "Lutherans."

Certain French Protestant historians, such as John Vienot or Eugene Choisy, would like to break the direct tie which attaches primitive French Protestantism to the friar of Wittenberg. These historians, moved by chauvinism rather than by historical evidence, have imagined an independent "French Reformation" which has absolutely no factual basis. Such historians like to consider Lefèvre d'Etaples (1455-1537) the precursor of French Protestantism, just as some consider Desiderius Erasmus a precursor of Luther. "The truth is," writes Professor André Jundt, "that in France, as everywhere, there was in the air an aspiration and a desire for reform, without which the words of Luther would not have found the profound echo they did in the hearts of the people but would have been lost in a vacuum; yet it is no less true that without these words there would not have been a popular movement, there would not have been any martyrs, and the French Reformation before Calvin would not have been what it was."[2] The religious experience of Luther was not merely that of a sixteenth century Saxon monk. It is the experience of man wherever and whenever he is found, whether in France, in Germany, or any other place. That is why Lutheranism is as universal as Christianity itself. The Lutheran Church in the world, with its 67,000,000 members scattered in almost every country of the earth, is an evidence of this universalism.

In France the initial shock took place on April 15, 1521, when the Sorbonne[3] condemned the doctrines of Luther. The works of the Re-

1 Translated from the French by Sheldon Torgerson.

2 A. Jundt, *Histoire résumée de l'Eglise Luthérienne en France* (Paris, 1935), p. 13.

3 Faculty of Theology in Paris, which then had authority over religious questions.

former, it was stated, "must be entirely eradicated, publicly delivered to the avenging flames, and their author constrained by every possible means to make a solemn, public renunciation." This condemnation posed the question in the clearest and most precise terms. From this moment on, whoever gave some thought to the religious question had to do so in terms of Luther. The prohibition rapidly became an encouragement to disobey the interdiction. The curiosity of Frenchmen was aroused, and the condemned books circulated under cover more widely than they probably would have if they had not been banned. The writings of the Reformer were read with eagerness in spite of the danger.

The influence of Luther was at first exercised in his own order, the Augustinian Hermits. The first Evangelical martyrs were three members of this order who were burned at the stake in Antwerp in 1523. Several days later, on August 8, Jean Vallière, another member of the order, was burned in Paris. He was accused of having submitted to "the terrible influences of certain people belonging to the party of the heretical Luther." The same day writings of the Reformer were burned in front of the Church of Notre Dame in Paris. These first martyrs were accused by their contemporaries of being "Lutherans." The influence from Wittenberg was called "the Lutheran plague." At Meaux, a little town twenty-five miles east of Paris, Bishop Briçonnet (1470-1534) organized a congregation of "Lutherans." Disciples of Luther were burned at the stake or imprisoned, but nothing was able to stop the progress of the movement until about 1530. At that time John Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* appeared, and Calvin became the organizer of the French Reformation and caused it to undergo a change of orientation. No Lutheran church was henceforth organized in France until the seventeenth century, though the influence of Luther remained.

Lutheranism in Alsace and Montbéliard

Strasbourg, a free city of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation until it was attached to France, adopted the reforms of Luther very early. Since 1521 the Gospel had been preached there by Matthew Zell, a cathedral preacher who had been won for the Reformation by reading the writings of Luther. Soon afterwards men as remarkable as Wolfgang Capito (1478-1541) and Martin Bucer (1491-1551) gave their impulse to the movement. The latter soon took over the direction of the Reformation in Alsace. The Latin mass was abolished, convents

were closed, schools were opened, and even a theological seminary was started under the direction of the famous humanist, John Sturm (1507-1589). German services were introduced and preaching increased. All this was with the authorization and support of the magistracy of the city. The movement spread quickly to other cities of Alsace: Wissembourg (1522-1523), Sélestat, birthplace of Bucer (1522), Bischwiller (1525), and Mulhouse (1526).

Bucer, who advocated a union of Lutherans and Reformed and yet was attached to Lutheran principles, attended the Colloquy of Marburg in 1529, where the disagreement between the Zwinglians and the Lutherans was discussed. Afterwards Bucer and Capito drew up the "Tetrapolitan Confession,"[4] which was presented to Emperor Charles V at Augsburg in 1530 in order to affirm the fidelity of the signers to the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Except for Mulhouse, which declared itself for Zwingli, the delegates of the four cities then signed the Augsburg Confession. The Reformation was officially introduced in the whole of Alsace in 1545, and the direction of the "Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession" was entrusted to an ecclesiastical inspector residing at Bouxwiller.

By the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) Alsace was given to France, and King Louis XIV solemnly promised to respect the Protestantism of this province. In spite of this, however, the influence of the secretary of war, Louvois, on Louis XIV was such that the cathedral as well as certain other churches were given to the Roman Catholics, and the *simultaneum*[5] was introduced in more than 150 Alsatian churches.

Lutheranism also penetrated the *pays de Montbéliard* in a somewhat different manner. This area had been dependent on Württemberg for many centuries and yet had always been attached to France by language, culture, and customs.

The Reformation in Montbéliard was initiated by William Farel (1489-1565). He had belonged to the group of "Lutherans" who met at Meaux with Bishop Briçonnet. He arrived at Montbéliard in June, 1524, "requested by the people and with the consent of the prince," Duke Ulrich of Württemberg. Following a decree of the archbishop of Besançon, Farel had to leave Montbéliard in March, 1525, but his work was taken up in 1535 by his friend, Peter Toussain (1495-1573). On Easter Sun-

4 Common confession of the four free cities: Strasbourg, Constance, Memmingen, Lindau.
5 A single church building used for both Protestant and Catholic services.

day, 1539, the Lord'sSupper was celebrated for the first time according to Evangelical teaching. Toussain and his son, Daniel, experienced many difficulties in the defense of Lutheran teachings against the influences of the Reformed theology coming from Switzerland and France. The French royal power which, in January, 1644, had taken the *Comté* of Montbéliard under its protection, supported Catholic intrigues against adherents of the Evangelical faith. In spite of these difficulties, religious liberty was extended to all confessions by the Treaty of Westphalia: "Each prince was free to adopt or maintain the religion of his own choice and had the right to impose it on his people."[6] "Because of its dependence on Württemberg, Montbéliard remained a small Lutheran city, though among the middle classes there was sympathy for the Reformed theology of France, Switzerland, and elsewhere."[7]

France had always attracted the people of the *Comté,* which was French by language and race. This state of affairs had prevented complete union with Württemberg. Most of the people of Montbéliard wished to be annexed to France. During the French Revolution, the last count having withdrawn to Württemberg, the Convention took possession of Montbéliard in the name of France on October 10, 1793.

As for all of France, the revolutionary period was a time of crisis for the Lutheran Church of Alsace and Montbéliard. Places of worship were closed, and the worship of the Goddess of Reason was celebrated in St. Martin's Church in Montbéliard. "In 1793 public worship was banned in Alsace. At Strasbourg church bells were melted down; objects of worship were sold for the benefit of the state; because of the quartering of troops, the churches were turned into stables and warehouses."[8] The pastors, however, were able to remain in the parsonages and continue to exercise their ministry in the homes of the families. At last the church emerged from the storm. Freedom of worship was proclaimed for all of France on February 21, 1795. Bonaparte, as premier consul, made peace with the Roman Catholic Church by a concordat and organized the Protestant Churches by the *Articles organiques* of April 8, 1802, recognizing on the one hand the Reformed Church[9] and

6 A. Jundt, *op. cit.,* p. 89.

7 J. Vienot, *Histoire de la Réforme française des origines a l'Edit de Nantes* (Paris, 1926), p. 566.

8 G. Anrich, *Die evangelische Kirche in Elsass-Lothringen nach Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1913), p. 24.

9 In France the term "Reformed Church" is applied only to the followers of Calvin or Zwingli and does not include other non-Lutheran Protestants.

on the other the Church of the Augsburg Confession, the latter comprising the churches of Alsace and Monbéliard, to which was soon to be added the church of Paris.

Beginnings of the Lutheran Church in Paris

Whereas Lutheranism developed successfully in Alsace and was established solidly in Montbéliard, we do not hear anything about it throughout the rest of France for about a hundred years. It is noteworthy, however, that the Lutheran Church in Paris was not to be an extension of the churches in Alsace and Montbéliard. It was to have its own independent origin and its own history, taking on an aspect peculiar to itself.

After the Edict of Nantes, promulgated by King Henry IV in 1598, the Reformed Church enjoyed a time of great prosperity during the entire first quarter of the seventeenth century. The life of the church was surrounded by a certain splendor. Men of great worth and men of noble rank took part in the synodical assemblies. At Die, Sedan, and Saumur there were famous academies[10] where the theological sciences were cultivated with success alongside of other disciplines. The Reformed Church also had its enemies, and not the least was Cardinal Richelieu. However, in March, 1629, at Nimes, after the siege and capture of the city of La Rochelle, King Louis XIII confirmed the Edict of Toleration of 1598. It was at this moment of greatest power of the Reformed Church that a Lutheran congregation suddenly appeared in Paris. An act establishing a church conforming to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession was drawn up on December 1, 1626. This act was signed by a large number of persons; sixty-three pages were covered with their signatures. A parish register was started, and 3,580 names of parishioners who promised to adhere to the church and its confession of faith were recorded between 1676 and 1685. The first pastor of the young church was Jonas Hambré, "theologian and preacher of his royal majesty of Sweden and honorary royal professor of the Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic languages at the University of Paris." The congregation met in the chapel of the Swedish embassy, of which Hambré was the chaplain. Because of a royal authorization dating February 13, 1630, services were held there and the sacraments

10 Academies correspond somewhat to American colleges.

administered in a somewhat liberal fashion, even during the time of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by King Louis XIV and in the dark days of persecution which followed.

Jonas Hambré had many successors whose names have been preserved. One of them, Mettenius, in 1726 celebrated the first centennial of the inauguration of the Lutheran Church in Paris. In 1742, Frederick Baer began services in the French language because of the interest of many French people, which indicated that the work was not destined only for foreigners sojourning in the capital. In 1784 the last pastor of the Swedish embassy church began his work. He was Charles Christian Gambs (1759-1822) from Strasbourg, who was able to maintain the services and the life of the parish during the most difficult days of the "Terror," until 1806, when by action of the police he was forced to leave Paris. In his last sermon he was able to say: "The Lutherans of Paris, whatever may be their number, form a core of peaceful, hard-working citizens, held in esteem by their fellow-citizens, prospering under auspices of honesty, hard work, and thrift, and showing by their example that godliness is of value in every way, as it holds promise for the present and also for the life to come." After almost two centuries of prosperous life, the chapel of the Swedish embassy was closed. The Paris Lutherans then turned to the chaplain of the Danish embassy, Pastor Goerike, who welcomed them and continued the services in the French language until the chapel of the Danish embassy was also closed

Official Establishment of a Church in Paris

The Reformed Church was officially recognized December 2, 1802. A decree of the premier consul created a consistorial Reformed Church[11] in Paris. Nothing like this had been done for the Lutherans. However, after the closing of the embassy chapels, a decree was issued by Emperor Napoleon I on July 18, 1806, ordering the organization of a Lutheran Church in Paris. A new decree appeared on August 15, 1806, establishing an oratory[12] in Paris, set aside for the services of adherents of the Augsburg Confession and attached administratively to the consistory of Temple-Neuf in Strasbourg. This attachment to an Alsatian consistory was far from satisfactory to the Lutheran congregation at

11 A type of organization recognized by the state as having full right to exist.

12 As distinguished from a consistorial church, an oratory was dependent upon a consistorial church.

Paris, for services were to be given by only one pastor, whose salary was half that of the Reformed ministers.

On November 4, 1806, a meeting was held by about fifty members of the congregation who named a committee of seven members charged with negotiating with *le ministre des cultes*[13] and the prefect of the Seine. Their triple goal was to choose a place of worship, find a qualified pastor, and persuade the government to make desired modifications of the decree of August 15. A first petition, with 592 signatures, was sent to the emperor without success. A second petition was then submitted to General Walther (1761-1813), son of a Lutheran pastor of Alsace and aide de camp to the emperor, to be put directly into the emperor's hands. This second petition, drawn up in August, 1807, demanded a consistorial church, two pastors, and a yearly salary of 3,000 francs for each pastor. Walther delivered it to the emperor on February 25, 1808. The emperor responded by signing, at Nantes on August 11, 1808, a decree instituting at Paris a consistorial Lutheran church and supplying it with two pastors with the same salary as their Reformed colleagues. A formal decree was signed at Bayonne on July 20, 1808, authorizing the city of Paris to buy the church of the Carmes-Billettes. The buildings and the grounds were purchased at the modest sum of 73,000 francs (about $15,000). Restored in 1756, the Billettes Church was abandoned during the Revolution, and it served for a time as a salt warehouse. This church with its beautiful fifteenth century cloister became the first Lutheran sanctuary in Paris. The years 1808 and 1809 were devoted to the organization of the church. On October 21, 1808, an assembly of twenty-five notables elected a twelve-member consistory which included Generals Rapp, Walther, and Dentzel. The consistory met for the first time on October 26. On January 1 of the following year the consistory held the first election for pastors. The former chaplain of the Swedish embassy, Gambs, then a refugee in Bremen, and Georges Boissard (1783-1838), native of Montbéliard, were elected. When Gambs refused the call, the position was offered to Jean-Jacques Goepp (1771-1835), assistant pastor at Strasbourg. These nominations were confirmed by a decree of April 13, 1809.

The work of putting the Billettes Church in order took much time, but at last the day for the dedication (Sunday, November 26, 1809)

13 The state official charged with oversight over religious affairs in a state church.

arrived. Joy and thanksgiving were in the hearts of the faithful. It is easy to understand their sentiments, for these people had lived during the difficult days of the Revolution and the Terror and had been treated for a long time as foreigners in their own country. Now at last they were acknowledged as legitimate children. They rejoiced in the benefits, so greatly desired, of freedom of conscience and religion. Because of this the date could not be forgotten; it was commemorated as the "Festival of the Church," celebrated annually on the last Sunday of the church year.

The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

During the nineteenth century the history of the Lutheran Church in France was that of a struggle among diverse theological tendencies which took place especially in Alsace, where the theological faculty was located. Since the beginning of the century rationalism made itself felt as a result of the teaching of Professors Blessig (1747-1816) and Haffner (1751-1832), both of Strasbourg. Pietism, on the other hand, had an eminent representative in the person of Pastor Härter (1797-1874), of the Temple-Neuf Church in Strasbourg. Finally, confessional Lutheranism, under the impulse of the pastor of Saint-Pierre-le-Jeune at Strasbourg, Theodore Horning (1809-1882), vigorously opposed the theological liberalism which was represented in the faculty of theology by the dogmatician Bruch, the exegete E. Reuss, and the professor of practical theology, Colani. Paris became involved in these doctrinal controversies, and always on the side of confessional orthodoxy. There Lutheran teaching found an interpreter of great value in Felix Kuhn (1824-1905).

What was, above all, characteristic of this time was the expansion of the Lutheran Church in Paris, especially from 1840 to 1870. In Alsace the Lutheran Church represented a majority of the Protestant population, and Montbéliard presented the same picture in miniature; there were almost as many Lutheran church as villages. The situation was different in Paris, where the Lutheran Church was a very small minority which must remain on the offensive in order to live. In 1830 a third pastorate was added, and in 1839 a fourth. A second place of worship, Redemption Church, was started June 25, 1843. During

these years of expansion, three places of worship were opened in the *faubourgs*.[14] Outside of Paris parishes were started in Lyon and Nice. Home mission work was begun and produced six more parishes. In 1853 the ecclesiastical inspection of Paris was established.

After this period of expansion, two grave crises shook the Lutheran Church of France. In 1871, after the Franco-Prussian War, the church was mutilated. Separated from Alsace, without organization, and without a theological faculty, the two inspections of Paris and Montbéliard experienced difficulties, all the more because a strong movement in favor of union with the Reformed Church appeared in Montbéliard. By the grace of God the church emerged from this crisis and a synod met in Paris on July 23, 1872, to found the Lutheran Church of France, comprising the two inspections of Paris and Montbéliard. The preamble to the constitution of the church affirmed loyalty to the Augsburg Confession. Soon afterward another difficulty was surmounted: in 1877 the theological faculty of Strasbourg was transferred to Paris; instruction began on June 7, 1877, with about twenty students. This faculty was for both the Lutheran Church and the Reformed Church.

Having overcome the first crisis, the Lutheran Church was confronted by the Law of Separation, promulgated on December 9, 1905. How was the church to provide for its material existence by its own means? The necessity to do so put its vitality and faith to a test. The church emerged victorious once again. Two synodical treasuries were created, one in each inspection, to administer the income of the church and assure its material life. This was the work of the synod which met at Montbéliard in April, 1906. Finally, in 1918, the Lutheran Church in France regained its integrity by the return to France of the eastern provinces.

The Present Situation

The Evangelical Lutheran Church of France is a church independent of the state with a polity following the presbyteral-synodal system. Each parish is directed by a "presbyteral council," composed of at least four members (men or women) elected by secret ballot by all voting members of the parish who are enrolled in the electoral

14 The name given to some of the ancient suburbs, formerly outside of the city limits.

register. This council is presided over by the titular pastor of the parish. A general assembly of all the members of the parish meets at least once each year to approve the council's management of the congregation. The presbyteral councils send their titular pastors and two lay members for each pastor as delegates to the consistory, which is charged, for a given geographical area, with examining the decisions and accounts of the presbyteral councils and with the calling of pastors, nominated by the parishes concerned. The regional synod is composed of all the members of the consistory or consistories in the jurisdiction of an ecclesiastical inspection.[15] The synod meets as often as the needs of the church require, normally twice a year; it is charged with regulating affairs of the church at large and with resolving any religious and administrative questions which may arise. From its own members the synod elects a commission which, in the intervals between synods, carries out synodical decisions, takes care of current affairs, and determines the salaries of pastors. (These salaries are basically the same.) The president of the commission is always a layman. Each regional synod likewise elects an ecclesiastical inspector,[16] who is the spiritual leader of the parishes and pastors. Elected for seven years, his role is to see that the Word of God is preached and taught in its purity and that the sacraments are rightly administered. It is he who ordains and installs the pastors. The delegates of the regional synods meet each year in a general synod, which is the supreme judicatory of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of France. This synod makes final decisions for the parishes and is the only body authorized to modify the constitution of the church. The General Synod names an executive committee to carry out its decisions and take care of retired pastors, the scholarships of theological students, and the salaries of theological professors. The chairman of this committee is always a layman.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church of France consists of two ecclesiastical inspections. The inspection of Paris consists of (a) one consistory with 20 parishes (including those of Lyon and Nice), two annexes, and 21 pastors; (b) a home mission with one parish, one annex, and one pastor. These two parts of the inspection total about 15,000 members. The inspection of Montbéliard consists of five con-

15 Corresponding closely to a diocese.
16 Corresponding to a bishop.

sistories with 37 parishes, 55 annexes, and 33 pastors. This inspection totals about 35,000 members.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church of France, together with the Reformed Church, has a theological seminary in Paris. There is a chair for Lutheran Dogmatics and a chair for Reformed Dogmatics, thus respecting the differences of the two confessional groups. An Auxiliary Committee of Missions was formed to work in collaboration with the Norwegian Mission of Stavanger and also with the American Lutheran mission enterprise in Madagascar; it furnishes teachers for the educational work there.

The Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession of Alsace and Lorraine has preserved the organization which existed before the war of 1870. After 1918, when these territories, lost in 1871, were returned to France, the government kept the regime instituted by Napoleon I in 1802, which regime the Germans permitted to function during the annexation. This church has seven ecclesiastical inspections, 39 consistories, 211 parishes, 192 pastors, and approximately 350,000 members. The delegates of the seven inspections form the superior consistory, which in the interval between sessions delegates its powers to a directory, whose president is named by the government. The theological faculty of Strasbourg is a part of the state university.

A National Lutheran Committee, constituted by the National Alliance of the Lutheran Churches of France (A.N.E.L.F.), founded in 1950, comprises the Church of the Augsburg Confession of Alsace and Lorraine and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of France, both of which are members of the Lutheran World Federation. The headquarters of the Alliance are in Strasbourg.

The Danish Inner Mission, 1853-1953

By Stinus S. Loft

SEPTEMBER 17, 1853, marks the beginning of a spiritual movement in Denmark that has increased in intensity in the land of its inception and made its impact on the activities of some branches of the Lutheran Church in North America. The movement was begun by a group of laymen interested in the extension of the kingdom of God and the salvation of men.

This movement was cradled in a small village, Ordrup by name, in the Tostrup parish on the island of Seeland. The day selected far in advance of the meeting was one of those beautiful autumnal days when the sun is bright and the shadows are deep and black and distinctly outlined, a day when even nature symbolized the distinctive characteristics of the movement—the glorious love of God and the deep sinfulness of the world. "The Inner Mission Society" was chosen as the name for the organization that came into being on that day. Ever since its inception this society has made sharp lines of demarcation between light and darkness, and sin and grace have always been antipodes in its presentation and proclamation of the Word of God.

The season of the year in which the people, mostly farmers, were summoned to attend this meeting is worthy of note. Work was not pressing, the grain harvest had been stored in barns, and the root crops were still immature. The recent completion of the harvest was a strong reminder that the spiritual harvest was plenteous and white for the reaping. The sponsors of the meeting were conversant with the lack of laborers for this rich harvest field and desirous to meet together to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth the laborers needed.

Ordrup was the center of a wide territory in which the residents were in a state of spiritual awakening. Reverberations of the words of Søren Kierkegaard were distinctly heard. Kierkegaard emphasized again and again that the individual must have his account squared up with God. Contrition, confession, the cross of Christ, and a constant walk with God were emphases that pierced the hearts of those who read the writings of Kierkegaard. He was a John the Baptist who called upon

the people to repent, accept the Gospel, and become living stones in the true and genuine church of Christ. By the publication of *Ojeblikket* (The Moments) and many other writings Kierkegaard stirred the consciences of the people and helped them inquire, "What must I do to be saved?" Although he laid down his pen two days after the organization of the Inner Mission, his writings are still alive. Until fifty years ago Kierkegaard's name was hardly known outside the Scandinavian countries. Within the last quarter of a century many of his writings have become accessible to English readers and are making their influence felt.

The voice of Nicholas Frederick Severin Grundtvig, calling attention to the development and deepening of spiritual life through the Word and sacraments, was also heard. In many parts of the country conventicles were formed in which the followers of Grundtvig steeped themselves in God's message and were refreshed with the sacraments. Spiritual reflection and earnest meditation were provoked. The promoters of the Inner Mission were for the most part zealous adherents of this new spiritual movement.

Baptists, Mormons, and members of other sects were entrenching themselves in many localities and were drawing people away from the faith of their fathers. Of late these intruders had become very active and zealous in Ordrup and the surrounding countryside. The common people were bewildered. Lacking spiritual discernment, laymen were sometimes attracted by the teachings of sectarian evangelists who appeared from door to door and even in public meetings. Meanwhile, the clergy, steeped in the spirit of cold rationalism and too indifferent to bestir themselves to resist the sectarian inroads, stood idly by and said nothing. Their sermons were mainly harangues about being good and honest and instructions about tilling the soil to best advantage by crop rotation and proper fertilization.

The writings of Kierkegaard and Grundtvig stirred the people. Kierkegaard appealed particularly to the learned class, and Grundtvig made deep impressions on the common people. Such as were aroused from spiritual lethargy realized that drastic measures were required. The people had to be saved from sin and error, and the Lutheran Folk Church of Denmark had to be preserved as a place of refuge for the souls purchased with the blood of Christ and remain a depository of God's Word and sacraments, to be administered to the needs of the

people in accordance with God's will and grace. It had been sensed for years that the Word of God had departed from the church and that the sacraments, administered perfunctorily, were accepted by parishioners as a matter of mere form and custom. In several instances clergymen were consulted by spiritually minded parishioners who sought ways and means of provoking interest in genuine spiritual life and of counteracting the work of the various sects. In every case the pastors thus approached failed to respond favorably. In fact, many were indignant. They considered it an affront to be thus accosted by their parishioners. They let it be known that lay people were not to concern themselves about spiritual matters, which were regarded as the prerogative of the clergy. So the clergy failed to remedy the situation. If action was to be taken it was clearly up to the laity.

Jens Larsen, a blacksmith by trade who lived a short distance from Ordrup, had on several occasions proclaimed the Word of God in public. All who heard him were deeply moved by his message and testified to his ability as a speaker in terms of highest praise. Some attended the meetings where Larsen preached to satisfy their curiosity and behold a blacksmith with the presumption to act the part of a preacher. But his message found lodgement in many hearts. People who came to scoff remained to weep over their sins and find consolation in the acceptance of Christ as their Saviour. In the opinion of many Jens Larsen was the man of the hour, the man raised up by God in answer to their prayers. If this man could be secured as an itinerant preacher, and means could be secured for his temporal support, it was believed that spiritual life would soon strike root throughout the country, false teachers would retreat, and Christian joy would reign supreme. Jens Larsen was of the same opinion. He let it be known that he was ready and willing to relinquish his trade and leave his shop in order to wield the hammer of the Law on stony hearts and apply the sweet oil of the Gospel to repentant ones.

Invitations to and announcements of a meeting were sent out by Peder Pedersen, a farmer. The place appointed for the meeting was the home of a cottager in Ordrup, Peder Clausen, a most ardent follower and admirer of Grundtvig. Although clergymen were invited, none accepted, not even the pastor of the parish to which Ordrup belonged. The failure of the clergy to grace the meeting by their presence greatly disturbed some of the participants. A couple of pastors sent

an apology, regretting their inability to be present because the meeting was to be held on Saturday and Sunday.

Many spring wagons, loaded to capacity with people eagerly awaiting the transactions of the day, appeared in Peder Clausen's home enclosure in the early morning of this auspicious day. People from faraway places had traveled all night. Peder had made ample provisions for room and seats in his new dwelling place, which he had just finished and made ready for this occasion. At the appointed hour Peder Pedersen arose and briefly presented the reason and object of the meeting. Following this brief introduction he read the account of the Good Samaritan in the Gospel of St. Luke and led in prayer. Then for half an hour he unfolded the meaning and application of this account and presented in a most graphic manner the deeds of love and devotion the Good Samaritan performed in behalf of the unfortunate Jew who had been robbed and beaten and left half dead by the road. "He is an object lesson for us to emulate," Peder Pedersen continued. "He performed this act of love for a foreigner, yes, even an enemy. We are to perform such tasks. We are to help our countrymen, our neighbors, our friends, our relatives, and, if conditions warrant, our fellow men beyond the seas. In order to do this work we must unite. We must pool our efforts and our talents and our means. We must organize a mission society through which we can operate and go to the rescue of all our fellow men who have been robbed of the salvation procured for us through the cross of Christ and who have been beaten to death by the devil. We must apply the oil of salvation, pour into their wounds the wine of strength, unite them with Christ and with his church. We are to raise the fallen, heal the sick, rescue the lost, and give God the glory." These were earnest words, and they awakened response in earnest hearts.

Pedersen was elected chairman of the meeting. It was decided to organize a society and name it *Den Indre Missionsforening*, The Inner Mission Society. Peder Pedersen was elected president, and was reelected to this office annually for five consecutive years. During these years he performed his duties faithfully and diligently. At the close of the five years Pedersen felt that his strength was ebbing and he preferred to relinquish the presidency of the society and leave it to others. He was a sterling and genuine Christian. Three additional officers were elected, and together they constituted the directorship of the Inner Mission Society.

Jens Larsen, the blacksmith, failed to arrive on Saturday. A strong and brawny man, he was ill that day and unable to attend the meeting where his case came up for discussion. It was freely discussed. His duties were outlined. He was to travel far afield. He was to preach the Word in season and out of season, in public and in private, in homes and to individuals. He was to display, for sale, such pamphlets and books as the board of directors might prescribe, and none others. The proceeds were to be strictly accounted for and placed in the treasury of the society. He was to be remunerated for his services. The salary accorded him was 150 rix-dollars a year. It was obviously not for mercenary reasons that he entered upon the labors of an evangelist. He accepted the terms and conditions offered him and remained in service during the following eight years. His ability as a speaker was extraordinary. People flocked to hear him. In certain parts of the country meetings were attended by a thousand people several days in succession. His musical talent was a great help to him in conducting the meetings.[1] His personality was not the most pleasing. At times he assumed a haughty spirit toward his associates. He was not unaware of his own abilities. His blunt attitude and brusqueness of manner became more pronounced with the years.

A brief constitution of three articles was adopted. (1) The Inner Mission Society was founded upon the Word of God, the baptismal covenant, and the creeds of the church. (2) The object of the society was to bring about a true spiritual awakening and revival among those who slept in their sins, to prevent and counteract the rise and development of all factions and party spirit, and by the grace of God to lead the lost ones back to God, from whom they had strayed and turned away. (3) For the realization of this object it was resolved to support and encourage the brethren in Christ to stand fast in the faith, to be living witnesses for Christ everywhere, to speak to the unconverted and urge them to accept Christ as their personal Saviour, and to do all this on the basis of the Apostles' Creed and in full harmony with the Folk Church of Denmark. These were the principles and marching orders of the Inner Mission Society, established in Ordrup on that

1 Finding no hymn suitable for closing meetings, Jens Larsen composed one, "Brothers and Sisters We Now Must Part." The original two stanzas were later augmented by two additional stanzas by J. Boye. In this completed form the hymn was translated into English a score of years ago and appears in several Lutheran hymnals in America.

memorable autumnal day, now more than one hundred years ago. From these principles the society has not deviated during the century that has elapsed since its inception.

These simple country folk were keenly aware of the power and influence of the written word. It was unanimously decided to publish a monthly periodical, and each one present pledged himself not only to subscribe to this periodical but also to induce others to do so. The editorship fell on Peder Sorensen, of Ordrup. The name decided upon was *Den Indre Missions Tidende* (The Inner Mission Tidings). During the century this publication has made its appearance every month with the strictest regularity. For many years a supplement appeared every month under the name *Tillag til den Indre Missions Tidende* (Special Issue of the Inner Mission Tidings). The periodical is published today under the very same name, now in its hundred and first volume.

The movement attracted wide attention. In hovels and in mansions *The Inner Mission Tidings* was read. Accounts of the work and activity of the society were presented in this paper. Brief sermons appeared in almost every issue. Personal spiritual experiences were presented. Brief Christian stories made an appeal to many. The contents were presented in a style generally quite interesting and always easy of comprehension. The publication served its purpose exceedingly well.

Shortly after the meeting of organization a second missionary was engaged to help spread the Gospel by word of mouth. Jens Sorensen Dyrholm was his name. As a child he had lost his sight. He had a splendid spiritual insight and gained a hearing wherever he went. The labors of Dyrholm and Larsen were augmented by the efforts of thousands of others, for every member of the society was a potential missionary and evangelist. All members were urged and encouraged to speak a good word for the Lord. On streets and stage coaches, in stores and shops, the society members—the "saints," as they were called—would accost their fellow men to ask, "Do you have peace with God?" "Are you filled with the inner light?" "Have you accepted Jesus as your personal Saviour?" These searching questions were addressed from heart to heart. They were not always asked with Emily Post technique, but they were asked with great earnestness. Sometimes the questions were met with evasion, scorn, and insults. But in thousands of cases people were stopped in their onward rush to perdition and began to consider their responsibility to God and to their fellow men.

During the early years the relationship between clergymen and the adherents of the Inner Mission was rather strained. Clergymen looked with disfavor upon the movement, and in many instances an antagonistic attitude prevailed. The Mission people felt that the pastors could be of great help to them in guiding their work and in furnishing moral support for the great task they had set before them. The Mission members remained true and loyal to the Folk Church, attended divine services regularly, and were constant recipients of Communion. They proved to be faithful pillars of the Folk Church. Wherever the Mission movement gained adherents church attendance increased. The leaders and administrators of the movement impressed upon the missionaries the importance of visiting pastors of the parishes in which they proposed to conduct meetings in order to secure their permission and, if possible, induce them to attend the meetings. Any behavior that could in any way be construed as derogatory to the person or office of the minister was to be avoided. Meetings were never conducted during the hour of worship in a church. In time a wholesome spirit of friendship and cooperation developed between the clergy and the movement. Today about half of the pastors of the Folk Church in Denmark are adherents of the Inner Mission, and practically all of the pastors are on friendly terms with the Mission people.

The people of Denmark were saved from the inroads of the sects. About 98 per cent of the population of Denmark are officially adherents of the Lutheran Folk Church. Interest in the foreign mission enterprise and its support are phenomenal in Denmark. This, too, is a direct result of Inner Mission activities.

Eight years after the formation of the Inner Mission a few changes were effected. At the annual meeting that year it was decided to abandon the record of membership. Any citizen of Denmark is a member of the Lutheran Folk Church unless he files a notice of withdrawal, and as a member of the Folk Church it is his privilege to count himself a member of the Inner Mission if he so desires. No dues are exacted, no names are registered anywhere. The Central Committee appoints new committeemen when vacancies occur within its ranks. Elections take place at the assembly of members. The Central Committee is responsible to no other group. At the meeting in 1858 the presidency was given to a pastor, C. F. Rønne, a humble and spiritual-minded man who had affiliated himself with the movement a few years previously. Later the

Rev. Vilhelm Beck became president and remained in this office until 1901. Very few other changes have been made since then in the regulations of the society. The name has been changed a little and is now *Foreningen for den Kristelige Mission i Danmark* (The Society for the Christian Mission in Denmark).

Lay people inaugurated the Inner Mission in Denmark. They sensed the spiritual need of the times and exerted themselves to meet this need. Great things have been wrought during the century since the society's founding. Institutions of higher education are functioning under the auspices of the Inner Mission in several sections of Denmark. A large number of folk high schools have been established during the century. Within the walls of these schools thousands of young people from every walk of life are gathered for the purpose of giving them an appreciation of the culture, literature, and history of Scandinavia and of the world at large. Spiritual life receives due consideration. God's Word is effectively applied to the needs of the students. Instruction is carried on mainly by the lecture method and by a free association between students and teachers. These schools confer no degrees and impart no scholastic preferment. They prepare young people not for the university but for life. Their objective is cultural and spiritual development and attainment.

Inner Mission hospices and hotels are located in almost every city of the land, and in these people may be assured of Christian influences when away from home. Hospitals and other institutions of mercy are numerous. Throughout the length and breadth of the land, in cities and in the country, over 600 meeting houses (*Missionshuse*) serve as places for meetings and social functions. About 600 missionaries and colporteurs devote their full time to the work of spreading the Gospel by word of mouth and by the distribution of Christian books and tracts. Several publishing houses annually print thousands of devotional books. The people of Denmark are great readers and are reputed to read more Christian literature than any other people. The foreign fields are not neglected. Enormous sums are collected every year. Danish people support foreign missions with more money per capita than any other country, a generosity that has its root in the Inner Mission spirit. Since January, 1897, a newspaper has been published by the Inner Mission under the name, *Kristelig Dagblad*, Christian Daily.

In the 1860's and 1870's Danish immigrants crowded our shores. A large number of these hailed from Inner Mission circles. Urged by a sense of their spiritual needs, they established congregations in which work was carried on in their mother tongue. In 1872 several of these congregations united in a synod which still survives under the name of the Danish (now American) Evangelical Lutheran Church. Later on, October 1, 1896, another synod was formed and is now called the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. This is the spiritual daughter of the Inner Mission in Denmark.

A Christology of Function

By Joseph Sittler

IT IS significant that each commission reporting to Faith and Order in 1952 embodied within its report the conviction that the next endeavor of the movement must be in the direction of a vigorous restudy of Christology. Nowhere, so far as I know, did those who urged this step detail the grounds upon which they did so; but no great skill is needed to discern and state these grounds. Back of the church, within the church as the source and actuality of its life, stands the Lord. And within, and around, and out in front of the church stands the world that neither knows nor seeks this Lord. The church, under pressure from its Shepherd and under demand by the sheep, must confess the Lord, realize its obedience in the work of the mind, describe its faith in a continuing task of clarification and witness, and this entire task is the work of theology.

In the course of this confession, obedience, explication, and witness the church speaks of many things; our generation, at least as represented at Lund, was concerned with the reality of the church, the sacraments, Christian worship, and the authority of the Scriptures. When, in the course of inquiries proper to the explication of these themes, all concerned joined in a demand for fresh work on Christology, the recognition that shaped this consensus was surely this: that the church, on the frontier where new problems press and a new kind of mind inquires, is embarrassed in advancing its work so long as its Christology remains formally imprisoned in categories which are felt by the initiated to be inadequate and by the uninitiated to be irrelevant. This inadequacy and this irrelevancy are made the more painful because we recognize that the classical Christology of the Creeds perpetuates formulations which operate with a way of speaking about God which is incongruent with our time and its ways of thinking.

Classical terms were expressive of bodies; ours must be expressive of functions. Nicaea operated with the discourse of *statics;* contemporary discourse is permeated through and through with a world view

which is dynamic. For us, *persons* are not bodies, but units of force and will; all things are not bodies, but aims, means, and creations of these units. The classical relationship between bodies was positional; our understanding of relationship is functional.[1] Christology is therefore called upon to transpose an entire theological vocabulary to conform with a thoroughly functionalized understanding.

Several generations of biblical studies assert in a rising chorus that the Nicene Christology comes under a second charge that the church's Christology is radically reductive of the amplitude and variety of the biblical witness to God's relation of himself to the world in the person and work of Christ. In view of the foregoing, this paper wishes only to submit, for further study, four propositions: (1) That the biblical, theological energies released by the Reformers operate with inward necessity to deplete the intelligibility of the Nicene Christology. (2) That modern biblical and historical understanding joins to supply us with a way of thinking which at once preserves the religious intention of Nicaea and avoids its categories. (3) That primitive-church and patristic evidence, either ignored or set aside by the fourth century controversies as not appropriate to *their* way of putting the question, is strikingly relevant to *our* way of putting the question. (4) That to undertake a fresh explication of Christology in terms of functions is appropriate to biblical terms of discourse and congruent with what for better or for worse we now are.

1 "Modern physics has abandoned the doctrine of Simple Location. The physical things which we term stars, planets, lumps of matter, molecules, electrons, protons, quanta of energy, are each to be conceived as modifications of conditions within space-time, extending throughout its whole range. There is a focal region, which in common speech is where the thing is. But its influence streams away from it with finite velocity throughout the utmost recesses of space and time. Of course, it is natural, and for certain purposes entirely proper to speak of the focal region, thus modified, as the thing itself situated there. But difficulties arise if we press this way of thought too far. *For physics, the thing itself is what it does, and what it does is this divergent stream of influence.* Again the focal region cannot be separated from the external stream. It obstinately refuses to be conceived as an instantaneous fact. It is a state of agitation, only differing from the so-called external stream by its superior dominance within the focal region. Also we are puzzled how to express exactly the existence of these physical things at any definite moment of time. For at every instantaneous point-event, within or without the focal region, the modification to be ascribed to this thing is antecedent to, or successive to, the corresponding modification introduced by that thing at another point-event. Thus if we endeavor to conceive a complete instance of the existence of the physical thing in question, we cannot confine ourselves to one part of space or to one moment of time." Alfred North Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas* (New York, 1933), pp. 201 f. (Italics mine.)

I

The positive contributions of the Reformers were enunciated over against those themes which were thrust into the middle of things by the moral and religious concern of the age, and by virtue of the nature of the opposition. The necessary concentration was upon the righteousness of God, the justification of sinners, and the authority of the church. It was Christ in his work as Redeemer, and not Christ in his relation to the Father, which was the central problem. The Reformers' labors in the explication of the work of Christ resulted in a strange situation of which we are the inheritors.

The very religious realism of their biblical understanding, their recovery of the vigorous prophetic and kingdom-proclaiming immediacy of the Christ of the New Testament, generated biblical, realistic ways of thinking which were destined to transform the entire method of theology; and this dynamism, once released, cannot permit theology ever again to operate as if it had not been.

Furthermore, the Reformers' sense of continuity with the church of the first fifteen centuries, while it may have made them fugitively aware of the size of the revolution of which they were spokesmen operated also to permit them to speak of God in Christ in the church's given terms and remain quiet under a Christology which, outwardly undisturbed, was destined for radical criticism by virtue of the very dynamics with which they had invested *other* themes—God, the Word of God, the church, the sacraments. The result has been that when we in our day, inheritors not only of the theology of the Reformation but also continuing inheritors of critical biblical-historical studies, seek to administer the understanding of the Reformers, we are compelled to see the Nicene Christology in a way they did not and perhaps could not. We are more and more restless under the fact that this Christology operates to smother the dynamic energy of the biblical terms of discourse, prevents living and functional ways of speaking about God and Christ from expanding to their proper potential scope. Sixteenth century veneration for Nicaea has descended to us as a twentieth century frustration; the fourth century settlement of Christology so massively overlays the sixteenth as to make the sixteenth stutter as it addresses the twentieth. It is not too much to say that our theological tradition, whereby we try to gather up and contain in the theology of our day

both the fourth and the sixteenth centuries constitutes an invitation to theological hernia.

An instance drawn from the history of Lutheranism will illustrate the point. The Lutheran Reformation did not *overtly* lay its hands upon the doctrine of God. Article I of the Augsburg Confession reads: "Our churches unanimously hold and teach, agreeably to the Council of Nicaea, that there is only one divine Essence which is called and truly is God; but that there are three persons in this one divine Essence equally powerful, equally eternal—God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost—who are one divine Essence, eternal, incorporeal, indivisible, infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness, the creator and preserver of all things visible and invisible." In the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Article I dismisses any effort to expand the subject by saying that ". . . the adversaries approve of the first Article of our Confession." In 1537 Luther composed the Smalcald Articles, and after a re-statement of the principal teaching of the Augsburg Confession, concluded Part I by asserting, ". . . there is no dispute nor contention about these Articles, and inasmuch as both parties confess them, it is unnecessary now to treat further of them."

This is all very well. But overt acknowledgement of Nicaea was subject to covert reinterpretation. A consensus which is acknowledged with one hand is surely doomed to decisive modification on the other when, as Seeberg, discussing Luther, observes, ". . . the Gospel is in the historic Saviour and it is all there. Theology and Christology are no longer independent aspects of doctrine, they coincide. The Reformers knew no other God than the God who had manifested himself in the historical Christ and made us see in the miracle of faith that he is our salvation." This seems to be a true report of Luther, in any case. For he could declare, "I know no God, whether in heaven or on earth, . . . outside the flesh that lies in the bosom of the Virgin Mary." Luther never believed such a statement to be exhaustive of God as he is in himself—but he did hold that such a statement speaks adequately of God as we know him from below, which is the only place from which we can behold him. "Wilt thou go and grasp and meet God rightly, so that thou mayest find grace and help in him, then be not persuaded to seek him elsewhere than in the Lord Christ."

To be sure, Luther could write what he did in the Smalcald Articles about the received Christology, but his transposition of all theological

themes into the key of dynamic biblical realism actually fractured the Nicene settlement. He developed his Christology in absolute religious attachment to what God's Christ, in his life, death, and resurrection, actually *did* for man. All speculation was either set aside or quite burned away in the intense heat of this functional Christology of the office of Christ.

II

Modern biblical and historical understanding join to supply us with a way of thinking which at once preserves the religious intention of Nicaea and avoids its categories. In the Christology of the New Testament we are faced with several methods of expressing the mind of the church about the person of the historical Jesus of Nazareth. Of the belief that he was merely a great human teacher we find no trace. The Christology that prevailed was that which saw in him the incarnation of the divine Word or wisdom, which was at once the divine and living pattern of the cosmos, the agent by which the cosmos was created, and the divine mind imminent in the cosmos, and more particularly in the mind of man. It was inevitable that this cosmology should triumph in the end since it was the only one which could, with whatever difficulty, be formally reconciled with Jewish monotheism; moreover, it transferred the Lord from the realm of eschatology, which meant nothing to the Greek convert, into the sphere of cosmogony, which was one of the central problems of the Hellenistic age as we meet it in the *Corpus Hermeticum.*

If, then, reconciliation with monotheism was, and is, the point, we are able to preserve that without employing the substance, essence, hypostasis terminology of Nicaea. And in so doing we can actually serve better both the Scriptures and our own time.

Biblical and other studies since Harnack have served to confirm his bold essay in which he makes the following argument: It is a Semitic idea that everything of real value that appears on the earth has its existence in heaven. It exists with God; that is, God possesses a knowledge of it, and for that reason it has a real being. And it exists with God beforehand in the same way as it appears on earth. Its manifestation upon the earth is merely a transition from concealment to publicity. In becoming visible to the senses, the object assumes no attribute that it did not already have with God; hence its material nature is by no

means an inadequate expression of it, nor is a second nature added to the first. The Jewish theory of pre-existence is founded on the religious idea of the omniscience and omnipotence of God. As the whole history of the world and the destiny of each individual are recorded on his tablets or books, so also is each thing present before him.

Nicaea operated with quite different ideas. It is not necessary here to dilate upon the nature or the degree of that difference. The important step was taken when *Logos* was read in abstraction from the rest of the Scriptures, and even from the rest of the Fourth Gospel. Thus the way was opened to conserve monotheism in terms intelligible to Hellas. The result was that the relation of Christ and the Father was described in terms of pre-existence which were compelled to regard the body as inadequate, and necessitated the ideal ennoblement of the creature in terms of *assumptio naturae novae*.

III

Primitive-church and patristic evidence, either set aside or ignored by the fourth century controversies as not appropriate to *their* way of putting the question, are strikingly relevant to *our* way of putting it. Since the Reformation it has not been possible again to put the question of God in terms of substance and tranquil ideal essence. The problem of the knowledge of God must, with us, operate with the realities of energy, realizing will, purposive intention.

God as the doer of deeds proper to his will, "the mighty living active God" of the Reformers, has not only convulsed theological thought but has also informed and animated biblical studies. And some hundreds of years of thought, inquiry, and accomplishment in a dynamic description of life and the world have (although they do not constitute a revelation of God) built the theater in which the drama must for our time be presented. When, then, in an effort to articulate a Christology, we examine the understanding of Christ's work and his relation to the Father from this point of view, certain aspects of New Testament teaching, passed over by Nicaea, become of fresh interest. The Christology of the book of the Acts, for instance, is surely what we may call a servant-Christology. It is in virtue of his work as obedient, utter accomplisher of the will of God that Jesus is proclaimed Lord and Christ, "So let all the house of Israel understand beyond a doubt that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this very Jesus whom you have crucified" (Acts

2:36). "The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God of our fathers glorified Jesus his servant" (Acts 3:12). "It was for you that God raised up his servant" (Acts 3:26).

While, to be sure, St. Paul, in his service to the church of the Gentiles, explicated this Christ in terms of pre-existence in spirit with the Father, that description is never the center of his proclamation. In the apostle's clearest trains of thought everything that he has to say of Christ hinges on his death and resurrection. What Christ became, and his significance for us now, are due to his death on the cross and his resurrection. He condemned sin in the flesh and was obedient unto death. Therefore he shares in the *doxa* of God, "who was born of David's offspring by natural descent and installed as Son of God with power by the Spirit of holiness when he was raised from the dead" (Rom. 1:3).[2]

In some old writings of the New Testament from the hand of native Jews there are no speculations at all about the pre-temporal existence of Jesus as the Messiah. These writings simply express the old Jewish theory, and they go beyond it only in the emphasis laid on the exaltation of Jesus, after death, through the resurrection. Such a passage is I Pet. 1:18 ff., "You were ransomed from the futile traditions of your past by the precious blood of Christ, a Lamb unblemished and unstained. He was predestined before the foundation of the world and has appeared at the end of the ages for your sake; it is by him that you believe in God who raised him from the dead and gave him glory."

Here we find a conception of the pre-existence of Christ which is not yet affected by cosmological or psychological speculation. It does not overstep the bounds of purely religious contemplation. It arose from an Old Testament way of thinking, plus the living impression received from the person of Jesus. He is foreknown by God before the foundation of the creation of the world, not as a spiritual being without a body, but as a Lamb without blemish and without spot. That is to say, his whole personality, together with the work he was to carry out, was within God's eternal foreknowledge. He has "appeared at the end of the ages for your sake." That is, he is now visibly what he already was before God. What is emphasized here is not an incarnation, but a revelation. He appeared

2 The studies of Lohmeyer in which he seeks, by an analysis of the form of Phil. 2:1-9, to establish this famous pericope as an early liturgical sequence, and hence explain why Paul could appeal to its compressed and high Christology without explication, is an additional evidence of the proper center of Paul's thoughts.

in order that our faith and hope should now be firmly directed to the living God, that God who raised him from the dead and gave him glory.

I am indebted to my colleague, Professor Arthur Vööbus, for directing my attention to an extremely interesting fragment of patristic Christology imbedded in the work of Aphraat. This man was probably a bishop. His homilies indicate that he possessed a certain authority, and his admonitions to the clergy have an episcopal ring. His life was coextensive with the Christological controversies of the fourth century. Aphraat is a representative of Persian Christianity, a primitive type of the Christian tradition quite cut off from Hellenism. The archaic character of the community to which Aphraat addressed his homilies is revealed in his support of ascetic practices which were not common at that time in the West; for instance, only those were to be baptized who were willing to take the vow of celibacy and poverty. Christianity had reached Persia by way of Edessa and Arbela; the religious milieu of Aphraat was Jerusalem, not Antioch.

The above is noted by way of enforcing the indigenous character of the teaching which Aphraat reflects. It goes its own way, paying no attention to the problems currently discussed in the West. The Nicene theology is not evident. We sense, rather, a Jewish-Christian development on Persian territory.[3]

Particularly interesting is the way Aphraat deals with the first chapter of the Fourth Gospel. He does not understand Logos as did the apologists of the Western church. It seems for him to be quite uninvolved with these considerations which so enriched and complicated the term in Western theology. For Aphraat Logos means simply the voice and utterance of God. "For the Word is sent out through the Messiah, who is God's utterance and speech, and returns to him in great might." "In the beginning there was the Voice, which was the Word. . . . The Word became body and dwelt among us, and this is the Voice of God."

Aphraat also deals with the relationship of Christ to the Father. There is no mention of the eternal generation of the Son, nothing of hypostasis or unity of substance. This man operates, rather, in the context of Oriental ideas which are quite strange to the West. In the West, for instance, the heir is such by legally acknowledged blood relationship to the parent; in the East, a child who is no blood relation, but who actually does the will and realizes the purposes of the father, may

3 The source for the following citations is *Patrologia Syriaca* (Vols. I and II).

be acknowledged as legitimate heir by community consensus. "Therefore we also called this Christ the Son of God through whom we have known God. . . . Therefore we worship Jesus through whom we have known God. . . . We directly believe that Jesus is the Son of God and that through him we know his Father."

Very interesting is Aphraat's understanding of the relation between *vox* and *Deus*. Christ, as the voice of God, is to be understood as the one in whom the spirit of God dwells in full and adequate measure. The distinction for Aphraat seems to be a quantitative one. In the prophets, to be sure, this Voice dwelt, but in Christ it dwelt with completeness and with constancy. Aphraat's use of the analogy of the life of the believer in Christ to explicate the life of the Son in the Father is a very significant device for illuminating Christology. His discussion, for instance, of the passages in the Fourth Gospel (John 14:10-11, 14:20, and 10:30) reveals that he understands these statements in a way that is non-philosophical, non-ontological, and non-substantial.

IV

To undertake a fresh explication of Christology in terms of function is appropriate to biblical terms of discourse and congruent with what, for better or for worse, we now are. My own conviction that a Christology set forth in terms of function is a sharp need of our time has not been matured by nursing my theological hernia. Strangely enough, it has developed out of a teaching concern with the Fourth Gospel, the very document which is commonly used as a club by champions of the adequacy of the Nicene Christology. In the course of these studies I have sometimes wondered if such persons advance beyond the first thirteen verses of the Gospel. For the moment one does so advance, one finds oneself in a complex of ideas which live in unquiet relationship with the Logos of the prologue. The Logos, as we watch and listen, is not the tranquil continuity of the imperturbable Deity operating in a mortal and temporal situation. His will is in absolute subordination to the will of the Father, whose will he calls in graphic language his meat and drink. His glory is the glory of the Father. He does not speak of his own accord out of some will-less lake of divinity; rather "the Father who sent me, he it was who ordered me what to say." This Logos in the flesh remains within his Father's love because he has kept and keeps the Father's command. Just as he does what he does because he is who

he is, so he is who he is because he does what he does! The prince of this world has no hold on him. His coming will only serve to let the world see that "I love the Father, and that I am acting as the Father ordered." His oneness with the Father is an incomparable oneness of function.

The Fourth Gospel speaks about the life which the Son has in the Father to set forth the life which men may have in him and through him with the Father. This must be considered in any adequate study of Christology. And inasmuch as this oneness is presented as a perpetual interchange of love, decision, and obedience—terms which in the Scriptures are terms of existence, decision, and will—we are justified in requiring that Christologies of being recognize that in the Fourth Gospel, as elsewhere, a servant-Christology of function is taught with greater antiquity and with equal clarity.

The above discussion has been informed by no intention to bring under question what Nicaea sought to conserve, or to suggest that the oneness of the Father and the Son is other than a revelation inseparable from Scripture, catholic tradition, and Christian piety. The purpose has been, rather, to set forth the practical concern of a teacher, to ask how theology shall proceed in view of the general acknowledgement that formulations enunciated in one age are deepeningly unintelligible in another. The terms of discourse evoked by and addressed to one historical situation are no longer declarative of what they sought to say —a grammar of substance is alien to a grammar of function—and are therefore, for the contemporary church, neither adequate confession nor meaningful piety.

History as You Like It

By Lloyd M. Wallick

WHEN what I may call my active education began, fifty years ago, I developed a hearty respect for historical fact. I was taught by a variety of teachers—many of them able and thoughtful men—that facts are stubborn things, that they cannot really be manipulated, that the individual's likes and dislikes, desires and prejudices, opinions and judgments must be adjusted to—nay, controlled by—the facts, and not the other way around. I was indoctrinated in the concept that there is something not less than sacred about history, that the true record of what has happened in the past is inviolable, that it is a negation of all scholarly method—indeed, of honesty itself—to tamper with the facts. The supreme intellectual crime, I came to believe, is the perversion of history.

I hope I have not forgotten these lessons, but I now feel that both I and my teachers of those days were a little naive. It is not quite so simple and uncomplicated as we then thought. We were prepared to recognize that the reading of the record of the past, the interpretation of the facts of history, would be bound to produce diversity. What we did not realize was that, consciously or unconsciously, men alter or modify the record itself and on that basis proceed to interpretation. We did not recognize that we were doing that very thing ourselves!

Let me try to explain what I mean by a sort of oblique allusion: We Protestants frequently accuse Roman Catholics of arguing in history and theology on the principle of "*potuit, decet, fecit*," which—freely translated and with reference to the present theme—means that "it could happen, it was fitting that it should, therefore it did." I maintain that all of us, not just benighted Roman Catholics, are guilty of this neat perversion of logic in our evaluation of history. Pointing out the mote that is in our brother's eye, we fail to recognize the beam that is in our own. What makes this the more reprehensible is that, all along, we continue to profess our adherence to the primacy of facts. Yet we are so reluctant to let the facts speak for themselves.

But I should, at this point, make some modification. There are those who deny the supremacy of the factual and boldly maintain the

supremacy of dogmatic principle. This is what we see—in respect of science, the arts, and history—in Soviet Russia today. The Marxian thesis, as developed and improved by Lenin and Stalin, is held to be above criticism. Everything must conform with it. History, the record of actual events, is quite secondary. Similarly, in Roman Catholicism, the historical has been forsaken in favor of the dogmatic. The living voice of the infallible church, especially as that comes to expression in its "efficient cause," the pope, is the determinative factor. This has never been more clearly expressed than, in 1878, by Cardinal Manning, replying to Protestant strictures on the dogma of papal infallibility. He roundly asserted that the appeal to history is treason. I do not know of any statement so forthright and uncompromising. It has been of infinite embarrassment to the Roman Church ever since, for that church tries to hold on to history with one hand and dogmatic priority with the other. However, when that business becomes too difficult, history is dropped. I recall a highly intelligent priest of my acquaintance (a former professor of Church History!) saying that he was not interested in the minutiae and obscurities of antiquarian research for the determination of what he was to believe. It is impossible, he said, in many instances really to know the facts. Better depend on the living voice of the church.

We, however, would claim that we are not as these sinners against history, these unjust men who despise what is written. We have a proper reverence for the record, we say, and cannot go against the plain facts of history. But some words of Dean Inge are not out of place with reference to ourselves: "The Deity, we are told, cannot alter the past. But the ecclesiastical historian can and does."[1]

We have, then, certain a priori ideas about the past. This is how it was because we think this is how it should have been. The consideration of how we came to arrive at such a priori concepts is beyond the scope of the present essay. I am concerned with the fact that we do have them, and that from that fact, as I see it, flow certain consequences for our view of history. With these I shall try to deal.

These consequences are a disregard of inconvenient and stubborn facts, and a bland and persistent emphasis on the factors which support our preconceived notions, to the depreciation of those which do not. I do not suppose that such results are deliberately intended, or even—

1 William R. Inge, *Truth and Falsehood in Religion*, p. 41.

for the most part—consciously achieved. But in any case, our view of history is definitely affected.

An interesting instance of the casting of the history of the church in the mold of a preconceived plan is the case of the so-called *Magdeburg Centuries*. In 1553 Matthias Flacius—stormy petrel of sixteenth-century Lutheranism, then settled in the town of Magdeburg—conceived the idea of writing the history of the church from the original sources, showing how, from the apostolic age on, there had been a steady and persistent perversion of primitive doctrine and practice, which resulted in the monumental and fundamentally anti-Christian structure of the papal system, this eventually overthrown by Luther, so that true Christianity was restored. In the prosecution of his scheme, Flacius enlisted the help of numerous collaborators, secured extensive financial backing, ransacked the libraries of all central Europe for source material, and during the years 1559 to 1574 published the comprehensive chronicle. It dealt with the first 1300 years of church history *"secundum singulas centurias"* (hence its common name), and was really a remarkable achievement, so successful in realizing its defined objective that it came to be called a *"pestilentissimum opus"* by Roman Catholics. The great German Jesuit, Peter Canisius, wrote against it himself and kept urging a complete refutation. This was not forthcoming until Caesar Baronius wrote his *Annales ecclesiastici*, which appeared between 1588 and 1607.

Both the *Magdeburg Centuries* and Baronius' *Annals* followed the type of the ordinary medieval history manuals, listing data chronologically, without reference to relationships or development. Neither is free from errors in respect of date and fact, but both have the merit of attempting to work from original sources. I mention them, not because of their intrinsic worth, but because of their influence. They have largely set the pattern for the writing of church history from either the Protestant or the Roman point of view. Just as those German Protestants of the sixteenth century laboriously searched through the records of the church, which they then interpreted in the interests of their anti-Roman polemic, and as Baronius scanned the official documents to which he had access with the object of establishing Roman claims, so —generally—has the history of the church been written during the past four centuries. Ecclesiastical historians, working on the materials in these great storehouses of fact, have repeated or attacked the state-

ments of Baronius or the Centuriators, as the case might be, always in the attempt to make the facts support a preconceived thesis. Nowadays, therefore, we observe whether a book is written from the point of view of Roman Catholicism, of Protestantism (conservative or liberal), of Anglicanism, of Lutheranism, etc., and we make our evaluations accordingly.

I dare say that, while we all fail of complete objectivity, Roman Catholics have more difficulty in this respect. They have always to conform to pattern and to make certain that inconvenient facts are put in their place—as a long succession of able scholars, from Acton to Duchesne, have found to their sorrow. But we Protestants have not too much about which to boast, for some of the most completely prejudiced and intrinsically worthless efforts in the field of church history emanate from our circles.

But history as you like it is not always the result of a dogmatic bias and the manipulation of facts necessary to establish a preconceived thesis. The process may be more subtle—or maybe it is just more simple! It consists of that selection and repetition of which I have spoken, which —if long enough continued—is likely to produce the desired impression. I adduce three illustrations: the history of the Vatican Council of 1870, the origin and growth of Mormonism, the development of Christian Science.

I

The history of the Vatican Council is exceptionally well-documented. The proposal for its convocation elicited enormous debate, in a veritable flood of books, pamphlets, and articles. While the official records of the Council have never been made public, and although its members were sworn to secrecy, reports of its proceedings constantly reached the outside world, so that all along the public knew what was going on. After the prorogation of the Council (it was never formally dissolved), discussion continued on the interpretation of its principal action (the decree of the infallibility of the pope) and in Protestant attack and Roman apology. Out of all this mass of accumulated and easily accessible facts truth might become apparent, one would assume. Not so! Those facts must be selected and edited for us.

At the risk of myself becoming tendentious, I would say that the facts appear to be that, while there was undoubtedly a great and clamor-

ous preliminary demand for the Council and the proclamation of the infallibility dogma, there was also an extensive (and a far more scholarly) objection to both on historical grounds; that, during the Council, the strategy of the opponents of the proposed dogma was one of emphasis on the undesirability of definition, behind which strategy was the continuing conviction of a complete lack of historical foundation; that, after the failure of this ill-conceived strategy, and the proclamation of the dogma, there was a long period of agonizing struggle on the part of many bishops before they could bring themselves to submission. This is all brought out in Dom Cuthbert Butler's definitive two-volume work, *The Vatican Council* (1932). (It is a marvel to me how that work has escaped the Index!)

But that is not the impression which the generality of Roman Catholics today has about the Council of the Vatican. After the lapse of only eighty years—not a very long time in the range of history—you get a different picture. What is now believed is that there never was any real doubt as to the definability of the dogma of infallibility on historical grounds, only some question as to its desirability at the particular time; that the opposition in the Council was negligible, confined to a few die-hard intransigeants; that the conduct of the Council was eminently fair and essentially democratic; that after the promulgation, submission was complete and acceptance was unanimous—except, of course, for a few self-willed intellectuals like Döllinger and Friedrich. Ask any informed Roman Catholic, and this is what he is likely to tell you.

How has this wholesale perversion of the evidence in the case come into currency? So far as American Catholicism is concerned, I think the greatest influence has been the little book of Cardinal Gibbons (youngest member and last survivor of the Vatican Council), *The Faith of our Fathers*. This was first published in 1871, has run through many editions, and is still published. Its distinguished author—a most attractive and popular figure of his generation (Gibbons died in 1916)—presented this mild and soothing description of the last great assembly of the Roman Church with so much success that it holds the field. Gibbons, during his life-time, was impervious to criticism. Men like Edward F. Stearns and David S. Schaff thundered against him in vain. So has the history of the Vatican Council been distorted, inconvenient facts disregarded or glossed over, and a definite point of

view established. Simple persistence in the repetition of statement has prevailed.

II

There is abundant historical material relative to the origin and growth of the curious semi-Christian movement we know as Mormonism. In 1827 an illiterate twenty-two-year-old youth, Joseph Smith, claimed to have had revealed to him, near his home in western New York, a record written on gold plates, containing the fullness of the everlasting Gospel as that had been delivered to the inhabitants of this western continent by the Lord Jesus Christ after his resurrection. The Church of the Latter-Day Saints was organized in 1830, grew in numbers, thrived under persecution, survived the murder of its founder, and finally (in 1847) established its permanent center in Utah. Candid and careful investigation seems to have proved that Smith was a self-deluded enthusiast, who was fortunate enough to found his movement at exactly the right time for its success; that the so-called Book of Mormon is really an unconscious autobiography of its author, with its crudities of expression and its manifold plagiarisms; that Mormonism grew and prospered in a frontier environment, where opportunities were lacking for critical evaluation and refutation of its manifest absurdities; that its history has been disfigured by repeated corporate offences against morality, to say nothing of law and order. All these facts have been brought out repeatedly in the books which have been written in critical appraisal of the movement and are—in part—admitted by many of its proponents.

The Mormonism of our day puts its best foot forward. Its apologists throw a garment of glamour about the person of its youthful founder. Admitting his practical illiteracy, they emphasize his spiritual sensitivity and his inspired imagination. Representing the checkered history of their movement as the triumph of faith in the trial of persecution, minimizing or blandly ignoring such awkward things as plural marriage, the Danites, and Brigham Young's barbarous doctrine of blood atonement, emphasizing their successful financial system and missionary propaganda, they have created a definitive impression, which is reflected in the popular estimate of Mormonism.

That estimate is distinctly favorable. Mormonism has succeeded—and nothing is quite so persuasive to the American mind as success. The Mormon system has achieved a remarkable degree of social integra-

tion and financial prosperity. You visit their Zion, see the things so well worth seeing, meet Mormons (who are like all other respectable people), read their literature, come in contact with their personable and persuasive young missionaries, and decide that the Mormons are not greatly different from other Christians, and probably a bit more in earnest and certainly a great deal more sincere and successful than most. Their history--well, it has become what you want it to be.

III

The religious movement which proudly designates itself as Christian Science is a familiar component of the American religious scene. Its members, belonging almost entirely to the educated and the economically favored, are admirable people who represent a constructive force in the community. Practically all of them have had previous connection with various Protestant groups and regard their present status as a distinct advance in the comprehension of truth. In their extensive and well prepared literary output there is constant reference to Mary Baker Eddy, "discoverer and founder of Christian Science." Anyone who reads to any extent in this periodical literature, or examines the numerous books written by Scientists and even by non-member admirers of their movement, will gain the impression that here was a rare soul, come into the world in the fullness of God's own time to reveal to men the supremacy of the spiritual, in her own experience and testimony to demonstrate the inner meaning of the Scriptures, and to present Jesus as the embodiment of the Christ spirit. The remarkable conglomerate of philosophy, religion, a system of faith healing, and a pragmatic way of life which goes to make up Christian Science is represented as her creation alone. The struggles of her earlier days are portrayed as cumulatively successful efforts of a wise, kindly, generous, and thoroughly disinterested individual to overcome prejudice and the adverse circumstances of a hostile environment. This is the picture of Mary Baker Eddy and Christian Science which is familiar to, and accepted by, most of us who observe this religious phenomenon today.

What do we find when we examine the history? A situation, to my knowledge, not exactly paralleled anywhere else. No group is so sensitive to adverse criticism, or so resentful of it, or so persistent in attempting to suppress it, as are Christian Scientists. In 1907, while Mrs. Eddy was still alive, a young woman named Georgine Milmine

was commissioned to write her biography. She spent several years in visiting the New England countryside and the Massachusetts mill towns in which Mrs. Eddy's earlier years were passed, interviewed hundreds of people who had known her, obtained access to numerous letters, records, newspaper files, and other documents, and came up with a detailed biography, the correctness of whose factual content has never been successfully challenged by the most zealous and thoroughly informed partisan. Can you refer to this book? Not too readily, for only two copies are known to be extant—one in the Library of Congress, the other in the New York Public Library. Years ago Christian Science authorities bought up the copyright, secured all the copies on which they could lay hands, and destroyed the plates. Milmine's first-hand observations are unctuously disregarded in favor of the idealized portrait which Christian Science now presents of its revered founder. To a lesser, but still to a very real, extent the same is true of Edwin Franden Dakin's, *Mrs. Eddy, the Biography of a Virginal Mind* (first published in 1929), and Fleta Campbell Springer's, *According to the Flesh, a Biography of Mary Baker Eddy* (which appeared in 1930). Neither of these books is easy to find. Copyright has passed into Christian Science hands, and the only copies obtainable are those which may linger on the shelves of second-hand bookstores. Sybil Wilbur O'Brien's *Life* is the only biography a faithful Scientist may read.

Mary Baker Glover Patterson Eddy was a remarkable woman. Beginning her activity at a time when organized religion was at a low ebb, and medical science was on the verge of the discovery of new methods and techniques, she and her movement are an illustration of the truth of Victor Hugo's dictum that there is no force in the world so powerful as an idea whose time has come. But that is no reason for the practical deification of a neurotic, self-centered, domineering woman whose restless energy and native Yankee shrewdness carried her on to success. Her true history is fascinating, but not fascinating enough for her devoted followers, who have decided that it needs idealization and have made the world accept the portrait which their continued persistence has created.

IV

We tend to make history what we want it to be by another subtle sort of perversion. While giving, or pretending to give, some recognition

to all the factors in a historical situation, we consciously or unconsciously make one factor our control. A certain school of writers on American history, for example, considers the influence of the frontier as the dominant element in our history. Events, movements, personalities, relationships, developments—all are evaluated with reference to this control. Other influences are minimized or altogether disregarded. Similarly, in the history textbooks used nowadays in public schools, the Reformation of the sixteenth century is represented as primarily a social or economic movement. Little or no attention is paid to its religious character. A reaction was certainly in order, of course, against the older view which disregarded the social, economic, and political factors of that great upheaval in western Christendom four centuries ago, but it is equally certain that it is a distorted view of history to regard its primary motivation as anything but religious.

Going much farther back into the field of church history for an illustration of the tendency to isolate one factor out of many in the given situation, consider the Christological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries. What brought them about? The manuals of church history, for the most part, will tell us that it was a theological interest. The church, confronted with the problem of the relation of the divine and human in the person of Christ, fought its way through to decision. The declaration of the Council of Chalcedon (451) settled the matter, and the failure of large sections of eastern Christendom to accept the Chalcedonian decree was simply the continuation of the heretical tendencies of Nestorius on the one hand, or of Eutyches on the other. This is the line consistently taken by all Roman Catholic, and most Protestant, writers on the history of doctrine. Without denying to it some degree of validity, we contend that it is a great and misleading over-simplification.

The careful student of the history of the church during this period will recognize a bewildering complex of motives and causes behind these unfortunate controversies—the fundamental differences of approach between the theological schools of Antioch and Alexandria; the rivalry and mutual jealousy of the sees of Constantinople and Alexandria for the primacy of the East; the pretensions of the bishop of Rome; the clash of personalities (Cyril, Nestorius, Celestine, Leo, Eutyches, Flavian, Dioscurus, Theodoret, Julian of Halicarnassus, Severus of Antioch, and many others through the course of two cen-

turies); the rising tides of nationalism, which threatened and finally destroyed the unity of the empire—all these played their part, and their significance needs to be assessed. But this is difficult; it is much easier to conclude that the issue was the comparatively simple one of the right or wrong of certain theological opinions.

The earlier phase of these controversies (that centering around Nestorius) affords an interesting instance of the influence of an obscure and otherwise unimportant individual in the creation of opinion. In 428, when the Nestorian controversy began, there was temporarily resident in Constantinople one Marius Mercator, an example of that most horrendous of all creatures, a layman who fancies himself a theologian. A fervent disciple of Augustine, a devoted adherent (perhaps a paid agent) of the Roman see, he recorded his biased opinions of the views of Nestorius, and his reports were accepted without question by Cyril of Alexandria and Pope Celestine. Roman theologians and historians ever since, down to our own day, have simply repeated his strictures. The Greek historians, Socrates and Sozomen, took them up. Centuries later Luther, writing on the Councils and the Church, perforce accepted as his authorities these Greek historians for Nestorius and the Nestorian controversy, and Luther's opinions were received without question in the development of the scholastic Christology of the Formula of Concord (1577). The judgment of a large section of conservative Protestantism on a certain phase of Christological doctrine is therefore dependent on the prejudiced observations of a theologically untrained layman of the year 428. It is only fair to note that the Anglican Hooker and the Roman Catholic Petavius were caught in the same trap.

Instances might be multiplied of the fact that history becomes what we desire it to be because we consider it in accordance with an a priori concept of what it ought to be, because we accept the repeated emphasis on certain aspects of the given historical situation to the neglect of others, or because we single out some one factor and make it the dominant control. But perhaps those we have adduced will suffice.

While there has probably always been this perversion of history into the pattern of our liking, I am inclined to think that we of the present generation are sinners above others that have dwelt in Jerusalem. Ours is not an age conspicuously dedicated to the hard disciplines of study. It is much easier to accept ready-made opinions. Perhaps I am wrong, but I cannot help feeling that we are more interested nowadays

in making out a case, in defending a position, than we are in the dispassionate appraisal of the evidence in the patient search for truth. It might be supposed that our modern facilities for the accumulation and dissemination of knowledge would make it easier for us to learn and value the truth, but the very opposite seems to be the case. Increase of these gadgets has made us no wiser, nor has it increased our desire to be wise.

It is not to be supposed that our situation will ever be greatly changed for the better. We shall continue to make history what we like it to be. No one of us, probably, is able so to change the point of view which is his by inheritance, temperament, or early training as to become completely objective in his reading of the record of the past. We shall never divest ourselves of prejudice or predilection. The most that we can hope for is the ability and the will to assess fairly all the factors in a given historical situation, and come to decision only after we have done that. We must remember that facts are stubborn things, that the attempt to manipulate them is the supreme crime against whatever intelligence God has given us.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

Let Man Be Man!

By Otto W. Heick

FROM its very inception the Reformation was enthusiastically welcomed by the Humanists of the later Middle Ages. In both camps the leaders looked upon Scholasticism as their common foe. Yet the alliance between these two movements was short-lived, for the Humanists were at heart much closer to Rome than to Luther because Aristotle, whom Luther despised as an "abominable heathen," was very close to the heart of both Roman theologians and Humanists. And the doctrine of predestination proved to be the point where the paths of Humanism and Reformation parted forever.

By common consent the doctrine of predestination has been mainly, if not exclusively, associated with Calvin. This is only partly correct. Luther, Melanchthon, and Zwingli, as well as Calvin, expressed predestinarian views at one time or another. Here I shall deal primarily with Luther's teaching of predestination because his view is little known and still less appreciated by many who today proudly bear his name.

The treatise *On the Bondage of the Will* is the most elaborate discussion of predestination written by Luther. However, it is by no means the only place in which Luther expressed himself on this doctrine. The thought that God is always right, whether he saves or destroys, was clearly expressed by Luther prior to 1525 in his Preface to Romans (1522), and the correlative teaching that the human will is in bondage is clearly stated in the Heidelberg Disputation of 1518 (Theses *XIII* and *XIV*) and was upheld by Luther in the *Assertio Omnium Articulorum* of 1520 (German edition of 1521, Article *XXXVI*). Moreover, Luther never recanted; until the end of his life he regarded the treatise against Erasmus as an adequate expression of his view of predestination.

Luther versus Erasmus

The controversy between Luther and Erasmus was occasioned by the latter's treatise *On the Freedom of the Will*, published in September,

1524. Luther's reply is dated December, 1525.[1] Erasmus considered it a superfluous and presumptuous undertaking to investigate the relation of our will to the divine agency. He held that we should be content to regard the will of God as the *causa principialis* and man's own will as the *causa minus principialis*. Erasmus' view was evidently synergistic.

Luther was troubled by what seemed to him to be the position of a religious sceptic. When he replied to Erasmus he was confident that he had the Scriptures on his side, and the Bible, he maintains over against Erasmus, is not obscure in these matters. In a discussion of man the appellation "free will" is a misnomer, Luther states. A theologian should avoid the term when he speaks about the nature of man. Freedom of will belongs only to God. If applied to man the term is blasphemous (636). Its defenders deny Christ (777). Divine grace does not tolerate alongside itself even the smallest fraction of human freedom (778).

As stated, Erasmus regarded the whole issue a presumptuous and useless discussion. Not so Luther. In his eyes the matter was not irreligious or superfluous. On the contrary, he says, it is salutary and necessary for a Christian to know whether he may or may not contribute something to his eternal salvation. Hence, he continues, "We must inquire what a free will can do, what it must suffer, and what its relation is to divine grace" (614). "We must clearly distinguish between the virtues of God and our own, between his work and our work. The true knowledge of God is at stake. Let God be God, but let man be man!" This is, in the eyes of Luther, the first and great commandment in Christian theology. The second task consists of this, he adds, that we must clearly understand whether the fore-knowledge of God conditions all things and whether man's activity is thereby determined or not (614).

Christian faith, according to Luther, is faith in God, who is the sovereign Lord of all. If God is by nature righteous and gracious, as Erasmus held, it follows of necessity that he is unchangeably just and gracious, "for as his nature is forever the same, so his justice and grace will never change. But whatever is true with regard to his justice and grace, must also be applied to his knowledge, wisdom, goodness, will, and all the other things pertaining to God" (615). Consequently God of necessity foreknows all things. And his foreknowledge is not conditioned by man's deeds. Over against God, therefore, whatever is

1 The quotations here are based on the Weimar edition, Vol. XVIII, the numbers in parentheses referring to the pages of said volume.

done by man is done "not by free will but from pure necessity" (615). "What is called 'accidental' in human affairs is so only in the sense that it may 'happen' to man 'accidentally' or 'by chance' or through our imprudence because our will or hand seizes the opportunity afforded, as if by chance, for doing what before we had no thought or desire of doing" (616).

For the Scholastics, Luther remarks, it was customary to distinguish between a "logical necessity" (*necessitas consequentiae*), which is conditional, and an "ontological necessity" (*necessitas consequentis*), which is absolute (616 f.).[2] To illustrate what is meant, the Scholastics said that whatever God wills must necessarily come to pass (logical necessity), but its being is not absolutely necessary; God alone is absolutely necessary. Luther contends that this distinction is a wretched play on words. In fact, only what is absolutely necessary has necessary being —only God, and nothing else or no one else. Man is indeed accidental and changeable. His whole life, however, is determined by God, who is of necessity *semper actuosus* (always full of activity). The doctrine of predestination, therefore, is of necessity implied in the concept of the personality of God. Unlike the god of Aristotle, the God of the Bible is never at rest. He is full of activity. Nothing happens without him. Nothing is efficacious without his will. His omnipotence suffers no limitation. He is the mover and agent in all things. He also moves and prompts the devil and all the ungodly to action (709).

Is God, then, to be regarded as the author of sin?

First, concerning the present condition of the world, Luther makes it very plain that he is far from accepting such a solution. Although, according to the foreknowledge of God, which is identical with his purpose, Judas had to betray Jesus, in no way did the lost disciple act under what we call "compulsion" (*coactio*), for as long as man is not moved by the Spirit of God, man does the evil with pleasure and of his own accord (634). The human will is like a saddle-horse which, bearing either Satan or God, always wants to go where the rider directs (635). If one rides a lame horse, one will proceed slowly; but the fault is with the horse and not with the rider. In the same way, if God prompts an evil man to action, God is not affected thereby. He remains good. The evil in our lives is our own guilt, not the fault of God. He does not create it in us. He finds it possessing us (711). Because of this condi-

2 Cf. A. C. Pegis, *The Basic Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas* (New York, 1945), I, p. 199.

tion we cannot, by the exercise of our will, attain to the righteousness of God. Nevertheless, in things which are beneath him man is free to choose. Here man is ruler and lord (671 f.).

Only once does Luther admit that one may speak of a "capacity" of man with regard to things divine. Man, he says, is capable (*aptus*) of being apprehended by the Spirit and filled with the grace of God because he is created for life eternal. "Who does not know that trees and beasts do not possess it! Heaven was not made, so to speak, for geese" (636).[3]

Second, side by side with the emphasis that God cannot work anything but evil with an evil instrument, we find another proposition: that God can improve the instrument. Yet why does he leave the evil will in many men unchanged? Here Luther carries his argument to the utmost extent of its development. Scriptures, he says, speak of God not only as not granting his Spirit to all, but they also declare that God positively hardens the heart of men (Pharaoh). If someone should ask, Why does God do this? Luther replies, "This belongs to the secrets of his majesty, to the incomprehensibility of his judgment. It is not for us to inquire about it; rather we ought to adore the divine mysteries. If flesh and blood want to take offense and murmur against God, they may do so, but it will avail them nothing, for God will not change. Even if a majority of men should fall back from God, the elect will remain."

"Similarly," Luther continues, "we shall answer those who may ask, Why did God permit Adam to fall, and why has he so created all of us as to be infected by Adam's transgression when he could have preserved Adam from falling and could have created us from something else or from a sperm previously purified? Because he is God his will has neither cause nor reason. No rule or measure can be prescribed for him. A will limited by a rule or measure, cause or reason, cannot be the will of God. For what God wills is not right because it is meet or fit for him. On the contrary, because he wills it, it must be right, no matter what comes to pass. A cause or reason is prescribed to the will of the creature, but not to that of the Creator. No one may be raised above him" (712).

The most important passages of the Bible quoted by Erasmus were

3 Cf. Brunner's emphasis over against Karl Barth that fallen man possesses an *Anknüpfungspunkt* for divine grace.

the sayings of the prophet that God desires not the death of the wicked, but that he turn from his wickedness and live (Ezek. 18:23), and the words of Jesus addressed to Israel as recorded in Matt. 23:37. Would God, Erasmus asked, bewail the death of the wicked if he himself causes it? Since God does not desire our death, it must be conditioned by our own free will. In answering this challenge Luther falls back upon the distinction between the *Deus absconditus* and the *Deus praedicatus* (the hidden God and the preached God), the *Deus nudus* and the *Deus incarnatus* (the naked God and the incarnate God), the Word of God and God himself. He appeals to St. Paul's statement in II Thess. 2:4, according to which the Antichrist will exalt himself "above all that is proclaimed of God and worshiped," whereas an exaltation "above God not worshiped and preached" is impossible. Of this God Luther says, "God, concealed in majesty (*Deus absconditus in majestate*), neither deplores nor abolishes death, but works life, death, and all things in all." Nor has he at all limited himself by his Word; he has kept himself free above all things (685). Because he does not observe this distinction, Erasmus deceives himself. God indeed does many things which he does not reveal in his Word, and accordingly he also wills many things which he does not show in his Word. According to his Word, for example, he does not will the death of the sinner; yet he wills it according to his inscrutable will (685). But if we further inquire how this inscrutable will is related to his revealed will, Luther at once declares that a veil is drawn over the inscrutable will of God, and all further questionings are excluded. "It is sufficient to know that there is an inscrutable will. But what God wills, why and how far he wills it, man must not inquire, desire, attend to, or mention" (686).

God does not want us to deal with him in his majesty, but only as he has revealed himself in his Word. It is the *Deus incarnatus* with whom we must deal—Jesus the crucified, in whom are hid all the treasure of wisdom and knowledge (689). "This incarnate God weeps, laments, and sighs over the perdition of the ungodly, whereas the will of the Divine Majesty, by its own decree, passes by and rejects (*reprobat*) some that they may perish" (689 f.). Predestination, therefore, is double: to some God gives his Spirit that they may repent and believe, while from others he withholds his grace and power lest they come to repentance and live. Reason is no competent judge. No rational argument is available to answer the question, *Cur alii aliis?* Inevitably an elect

will repent before his death, otherwise he would not be elect (650). But is God not showing partiality, and is he, therefore, not unjust in his dealings with men? To this question Luther replies that, indeed, much may be said in favor of such a view. Reason has no answer to resist such a conclusion. Yet the mystery, he maintains, will be solved in the glorious light of eternity. God, whose justice we cannot comprehend now, will then reveal himself as perfectly just in all his ways (785).

But granted that the doctrine of predestination is scriptural, is it not dangerous to preach it, and is it not destructive of ethics, as Erasmus said? Luther replies, "You say, Who will care to improve his life if this doctrine is proclaimed? I answer, No one, because no one can do it. Those people, of whom you say that they have improved their lives, evidently have done so without the Spirit of God; but with such God is not concerned, for they are hypocrites. The elect and pious will be corrected by the Holy Spirit while the others will perish uncorrected" (632).

Luther, then, presents two reasons why this doctrine should be preached. First, for the humbling of human pride and the recognition of divine grace, and second, the nature of the Christian faith requires it because it is a faith in things not seen (632). "In order that faith may exist, everything must be hidden. But it cannot be more deeply hidden than when the exact contrary is perceived and experienced. Thus God makes us alive by slaying us. He justifies us by making us guilty. . . . He conceals his eternal kindness and mercy under eternal wrath, his righteousness under injustice" (633).

In concluding his argument Luther confesses, "Even if it were possible, I should not desire to have free will or that anything be left in my hands by means of which I could obtain eternal life; for then (even if I were not subject to so many adversities and dangers and to the assaults of evil spirits—each one of whom is stronger than all men taken together—that no one could be saved) . . . I should always labor in uncertainty, since my conscience could never, though I were to live and labor forever, be certain and sure how much it was necessary for me to do in order to satisfy God. . . . Such has been the experience of all self-righteous people, and I myself, to my great misfortune, had for many years a sufficient experience of this kind. But now, since God removes my salvation from my own will and places it in his, and has promised to save me not by my own working or running but by his grace, I am sure and certain. For God is faithful. He does not lie. He

is so powerful and great that no evil spirit, no adversity can overpower him or pluck me out of his hand. . . . Thus it comes to pass that, if not all, at least many, are saved, whereas by the power of a free will no one at all could be saved" (783).

This is Luther's doctrine of predestination. It certainly is no milk for new-born babes, but rather meat for the strong. Of this fact Luther was well aware, as may be seen from his comment on Gen. 26:9 in his lectures on the first book of the Old Testament, delivered between 1535 and 1545. Here he refers especially to his treatise against Erasmus, emphasizing that man must not try to penetrate into the hidden will of God. On the contrary, if a man wants to be sure about being predestined to eternal life, he must look upon Christ and must believe God's Word and faithfully use the sacraments.[4] In his Table Talk[5] he quotes the famous remark of Staupitz, "Why do you trouble yourself with these speculations? Look at the wounds of Christ and his blood shed for you. From them predestination will shine out upon you." Since these words were written and spoken toward the end of his life, it appears that Luther never withdrew what he had written in his controversy with Erasmus. Until the end of his days Luther remained a predestinarian.

Melanchthon and the Formula of Concord

For the sake of comparison we may briefly state the position of Melanchthon and that of the authors of the Formula of Concord. In the case of the former, we must carefully distinguish between the younger and the older Melanchthon.

In the first edition of his *Loci* (1521) Melanchthon complains that the doctrine of the Gospel has been destroyed by the Aristotelian tenets in Scholasticism. Unlike Aristotle and his followers, the Scriptures say nothing about a free will, Melanchthon maintains. On the contrary, the Bible denies that man has a free will by teaching the necessity of divine predestination. Stupid and impious men, he says, may speak about a free will; but a Christian knows nothing of it at all.

One thing, however, is significant. The discussion in the *Loci* is linked up with a discussion of the psychological faculties of man. This starting point in time became a trap for Melanchthon. His continued

4 Weimar edition, XLIII, pp. 457-63.
5 *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 112 (No. 1490), 227 (No. 1820a), 562 (No. 2631b), *et al.*

studies in psychology, on the basis of Aristotle, must bear the main responsibility for his veering toward a kind of synergism in later years.

Commencing with the edition of 1535, the tenor of Melanchthon's treatment of the subject changed. Now he condemns those whom he had praised in 1521 and, *vice versa,* he praises those whom he had before condemned. The chapter now begins: "Valla and others have denied freedom to the human will because everything, they say, happens by a decree of God. This is a vain imagination and has its root in Stoicism." His own point of view is brought out when, a little later, he quotes with approval some of the "ancients" who taught that man retains a freedom of the will by which he can apply himself to grace (*facultas se applicandi ad gratiam*): that is, man hears the promise of God, he tries to give assent to it, and he lays aside all sins that beset his conscience. Since the promise is universal and since there are no contradictory wills in God, Melanchthon writes, of necessity there must be in us a cause of discrimination to explain why, for example, Saul was rejected but David was accepted by God. Accordingly Melanchthon recognizes three causes of conversion: the Word, the Spirit and the human will.

In passing, we may remark that the same change of sentiment is also noticeable in the two editions of the Augsburg Confession, the Unaltered of 1530 and the Altered of 1541 (especially Articles XVIII and XX).

The influence of Melanchthon is likewise quite pronounced in Article XI of the Formula of Concord. As a matter of fact, apart from the statement that the doctrine of predestination is "useful and consolatary," the whole article is rather un-Lutheran. Contrary to Luther, the authors of Article XI distinguish between prevision and predestination, denying that the foreknowledge of God is a cause of man's ruin. They also ascribe the hardening of man's heart to his own sinful disposition. It is noteworthy that they fail to mention the *Deus absconditus*, whereas to Luther this concept is quite fundamental. In quoting from Luther's Preface to Romans (Solid Declaration, XI, 33), the authors actually distort the real meaning of the Reformer.

In its positive affirmations the Formula of Concord teaches that whereas the foreknowledge of God is occupied alike with the godly and the wicked, "the predestination or eternal election of God, however, is

occupied only with the godly, beloved children of God, and this is a cause of their salvation."

A Critical Evaluation of Luther's Position

Luther's teaching is a strong invective against the two principal heresies of man: that reason is competent to establish Christian doctrine, and that man possesses a free moral will.

(1) Reason, Luther maintains over against Erasmus, has nothing to offer whatever in matters of the Christian faith. Our faith is built exclusively on God's revelation. "God is known by God alone," and by him to whom he wants to reveal himself. All religious systems based on human reason and speculation are nothing else than *larvae Satanas*. The revelation of God has taken place, once and for all, in Jesus, and is recorded in the Bible. This makes the Bible unique in every respect. Nevertheless, Luther states, the Bible must not be equated with God himself: "God and the Scriptures are two different things, no less than the Creator and his creation" (606). Hence the absoluteness of God cannot be transferred to the Bible. The book remains under him.

(2) The presumptuous attitude of human reason is to Luther especially manifest in the teaching of free will. This is the fundamental error of all religious systems. All religions of the world, including Roman Catholicism (which is Christianity perverted by Aristotelianism), have this one thing in common, that they teach that man is able, by his own power, to turn to God, while, according to the Scriptures, precisely the opposite is true: man has no power whatever unless it be given him from above. Salvation is *sola gratia* because it is founded solely on God's *agape*.

This insight into the nature of the Christian faith further implies that man cannot by his own strength bring in the Day of God. The whole concept of the kingdom as held in Neo-Protestantism, therefore, is utterly unscriptural. Christians who believe that they may at church conventions resolve "to speed the kingdom" are in the eyes of Luther *larvae diaboli,* instruments of the devil. According to Luther, they will not build the walls and towers of Jerusalem, but rather the tower of Babel—which God will destroy today just as he did in ancient times.

What, if any, are the objections to Luther's position? There is, first, Luther's argument that though the incarnate God may weep over man's perdition, the *Deus absconditus* will not. The implications of this

statement, I feel, are a foreign element in Luther's theology. Everywhere else the Reformer is very consistent in asserting that the true nature of God is revealed in Jesus: "Ask ye, who is this? Jesus Christ it is; . . . there is no other God. . . ." Evidently Luther resorted to his extreme statement in order to deal a death blow to each and every semblance of synergism. But by so doing he actually undermined the trustworthiness of the Gospel. The mistake which he made is this, that he tried to express in one logical statement what only dialectics can express. In every discussion of this problem we are faced with a Scylla and a Charybdis. An extreme determinism makes God the author of sin while, on the other hand, any concession in this matter, as if the will of God were conditioned by factors outside itself, leads of necessity to some kind of synergism. Yet in the light of the Scriptures both positions are equally untenable. God is not the author of sin, nor can man contribute anything to his salvation. Luther recognized this fact, for his God is after all not the arbitrary God of Nominalism. Instead, to Luther God is always right; he cannot do evil.

Is there any difference between Luther and Calvin in the teaching of predestination? Or is Calvin actually the most consistent pupil of Luther? Despite the fact that Calvin is much closer to Luther than the older Melanchthon, there is nevertheless a great difference between the two. To Luther predestination is a soteriological problem, subordinated to his quest for a gracious God. It has subsidiary significance only. Luther's thinking is infralapsarian. He is concerned only with the problem of how a man in revolt against God may be reconciled to his Creator. His teaching is determined by his desire to maintain, over against the whole of creation, the deity of God. To Calvin, on the other hand, the problem is metaphysical. The honor of God requires that some be saved while others are condemned. Luther's concept of God is fundamentally that of the New Testament (God is *agape*) whereas Calvin's doctrine of God is tinged with philosophical speculation.

One critical remark, however, must be applied to both alike. Luther, as well as Calvin, interprets the story of Esau and Pharaoh as implying that God rejected these men for all eternity. But is this exegesis actually correct? Many commentators today would disagree with the Reformers on this point. The rejection of Esau gave to Jacob and his descendants a preferred place in the divine economy of salvation; but does it of necessity imply the eternal condemnation of the

older son of Isaac? The only passage which could be quoted as supporting such a view is Heb. 12:27. Yet in his famous prefaces to the books of the New Testament Luther took offence at this statement, declaring that it seems to contradict all the Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul. In fact, to be passed by in time does not mean to be damned forever. The preferred place which the white race has been awarded in the history of the church is grounded solely in God's mercy, but there is no word in the Bible which would force us to believe that the passing by of the Chinese, for example, means that God has rejected these people forever. Likewise the hardening of Pharaoh does not mean that God predestined him to eternal damnation. As in the case of the disciples, the hardening may be for a time only (Mark 6:52, 8:17 f.). Every attempt to give a theoretical answer to the question of how God's eternal plan can be harmonized with the responsibility and guilt in man is doomed to failure. Actually, as Nygren writes, it will "involve an attack on God's deity."[6] Man must learn to let God be God and, as for himself, remain on the level of a creature.

6 Anders Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* (Philadelphia, 1949), p. 368.

Notes and Studies

PAUL'S USE OF "WRATH OF GOD"

By J. Benjamin Bedenbaugh

RITSCHL was carrying to the extreme a rather prominent tendency among some moderns to attempt to minimize *orge* (wrath) in the Christian conception of God when he wrote: "The notion of the affection of wrath in God has no religious worth for Christians, but is an unfixed and formless theologoumenon."[1] Crudely un-Christian ideas of the wrath of God have led to the perversion of the Gospel and have been the cause of the introduction of heathenish notions into Christian thinking. A survey of the passages in which Paul uses the idea of wrath may help us to avoid the pitfall of some traditional approaches and the equally serious danger of "modernizing" the apostle.

The expression (*he*) *orge* or *he orge tou theou* occurs in Paul at Rom. 1:18; 2:5; 2:8; 3:5; 4:15; 5:9; 9:22; 12:19; 13:4, 5; Eph. 2:3; 4:31; 5:6;[2] Col. 3:6, 8; I Thess. 1:10; 2:16; 5:9. The reference in Eph. 4:31 and Col. 3:8 is clearly to wrath as a human quality, and we need not consider these passages in our study. Even a superficial reading of the passages listed above makes it obvious, Ritschl to the contrary notwithstanding, that the concept is significant for an understanding of Paul.

Attempts have been made to relegate the concept of wrath to eschatology.[3] The eschatological emphasis is patent in Rom. 2:5; 5:9; I Thess. 1:10. But wrath is just as patently a present reality in Rom. 1:18; Eph. 2:3; 5:6; I Thess. 2:16. In Rom. 1:18, where we may have expected the perfect or the future tense of the verb, the present is found: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth" (RSV). God's wrath *is being* revealed even as his righteousness *is being* revealed. The parallelism in verses 17 and 18 is significant. Just as the revelation of the righteousness of God is a present reality, so the revelation of his wrath is a present and continuous reality. The aorist in I Thess. 2:16 has somewhat the same significance. It is interesting and instructive to note that in the Beelzebub controversy (Matt. 12:25-37; Mark 3:23-30; Luke 11:17-23) the same verb (*phthano*) in the same tense (the aorist) is used in our Lord's statement that "the kingdom of

1 Quoted by Orr in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible,* Vol. I, p. 98.

2 I am not unmindful of the difficulties involved in attributing Ephesians to Paul. Scholarly opinion is divided, and there are top-ranking men on both sides. I feel, therefore, that I am not by-passing a critical issue by including Ephesians in this list.

3 So Denney, Sanday and Headlam, Garvie. Among the dissenters are Weiss, Snaith, Wahlstrom.

God is upon you" (Matt. 12:28; Luke 11:20). Jesus' preaching the Good News of the kingdom of God and his exorcisms evidenced the present reality of the kingdom, and the machinations of those who would hinder the extension of his work meant the equally present visitation of wrath (I Thess: 2:14-16). Even if it could be established that wrath is for Paul exclusively eschatological, it would still be true, as Denney admits, that "there is no such thing as a future which is not the future of the present."[4] God is a self-consistent being, and he who will judge his people with righteousness is he who tabernacles with them. Salvation and judgment cannot be divided as present and future realities, respectively.[5] Nor can grace and wrath represent a real dualism in the relationship of God with man.

Where the reality and importance of the present nature of the wrath of God have been maintained, there have been two extremes of interpretation. One is so untenable that we shall merely mention it without discussion. Ultra-literalism in the interpretation of Old Testament anthropopathisms and the figurative language of apocalyptic have resulted in the description of God as a temperamental being, who is given to fitful rages of anger and retaliation. This conception of God is an insult to the divine love; it describes the divine personality in terms of emotion that we would frown upon even in human personality. Violent reaction to this misconception has carried interpreters too far to the extreme in another line of approach. C. H. Dodd argues that *orge* is tantamount to "an inevitable process of cause and effect in a moral universe."[6] There may be passages in which wrath is used "in a curiously impersonal way."[7] Surely there was a place in the thinking of Paul for the interplay of impersonal factors with personality, but the question is whether Paul, whose description of the relationship between God and man is in warmly personal terms, would use "God" in the genitive to describe an abstract factor in its relation to personality. There are three sure instances of the use of the full expression *orge theou* in Paul: Rom. 1:18; Eph. 5:6; Col. 3:6.[8] "His wrath" occurs at Rom. 9:22 and 13:4. Dodd argues against a personal interpretation of wrath from the fact that "God" is never the subject of the verb "to be angry." But does this not assume that personal "wrath" necessarily involves "being angry?" It would seem that this assumption is not warranted. Dodd finds in Greek literature no occurrence of *epiphero* (used in Rom. 3:5) meaning to give vent to passion against persons. According to his list the verb

4 James Denney, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 228.

5 Of the twenty-two occurrences of *sozo* in Paul, seven are future passive, two are future active (not of divine activity), two may be either future indicative or aorist subjunctive, five are aorist passive. Three of these are subjunctive (note the affinity of the future indicative with the aorist subjunctive) and the other two aorist passives are indicative and infinitive. Of the remaining occurrences, three are present passive, two are perfect passive (both of these are in Ephesians), and one is aorist active.

6 *The Epistle to the Romans* (Moffatt Commentary), pp. 20 ff.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 21.

8 Whether *tou theou* belongs with *orges* in Rom. 2:5 is open to question. Though *tou theou* is not in the best manuscripts of I Thess. 2:16, it is translated in RSV.

is used only with such objects as "war," "an accusation," "punishment." Liddell and Scott give *orgas* as the object of *epiphero* in passages in Cratinus and Thucydides.[9] I find Dodd's use of Otto's analysis rather unconvincing. Has the idea of "numinous" really undergone the kind of development in Chrisianity that Dodd believes has taken place with the idea of wrath? I think the answer must be no. Else God would be equated with the universe.

It would seem that Paul's idea of "wrath" is best represented not by a purely eschatological interpretation, nor by crude anthropopathism, nor by a purely abstract conception. Wrath is that activity of the divine love,[10] for which there is no exact counterpart in human personality, which stands in radical and dynamic opposition to sin.[11] It is completely moral. The God who has commanded us to love one another is not a being viciously set on revenge. He is the "Hound of Heaven," constantly seeking lost humans in order to bring them into fellowship with himself. A part of that seeking activity, a part of his activity of reconciling, is the revelation of his hostility to sin so that his children know with unmistakable clarity what his attitude is to sin so that he may teach them to be hostile to it and make them his instruments for the establishment of righteousness. "Wrath" may be used to describe the final judgment, but again that judgment will be the personal activity of a personal God. The law awakens a consciousness of sin, and with that consciousness there comes a realization of God's hostility to sin (Rom. 4:15). Israel, to whom this law was given, had become "the vessels of wrath" (Rom. 9:22). It is not necessary to hold that wrath is impersonal even in a metaphor like that one; for Israel because of her apostasy had come to show her Gentile neighbors the intensity of God's personal hostility to sin—even the sin of his chosen people. Paul can even contrast wrath with such an intensely personal activity as salvation (I Thess. 5:9). It is open to serious question whether the apostle would set salvation against "an inevitable process of cause and effect in a

9 *A Greek-English Lexicon* (fifth edition), p. 507.

10 Cf. the juxtaposition of the assertion concerning God's love in Rom. 5:8 and the reference to wrath in 5:9. "This is indeed the highest revelation of his love that he does not seek the transient happiness of man, but his eternal salvation" (Weiss, *The Religion of the New Testament*, p. 105). D. M. Baillie dissents from Dodd's view and describes God's wrath in terms of love's attitude to sin (*God was in Christ*, p. 189). Raymond H. Swartzback concludes a "Biblical Study of the Word 'Vengeance'" with the statement that ". . . we can never speak of the 'love' and 'justice' of God without reflecting upon his 'wrath' and 'vengeance'" (*Interpretation*, October, 1952, p. 457).

11 This is an attempt at an original definition. It may be helpful to gather here a few definitions from modern literature: "the holiness of God in unvarying opposition to human corruption, in lust, selfishness, and moral atrophy" (Quimby); "the consuming fire of inexorable divine love in relation to our sins" (Baillie); "the divine reality that corresponds to sin" (Brunner); "attitude of divine love toward wilful sin" (Stevens); "totality of the divine reaction to sin" (Stewart); "the manifestation, sometimes suddenly and immediately experienced, of that aversion to sin which is part of his [God's] character" (Snaith); "holy displeasure at sin" (Nygren).

moral universe."[12] To express the relation in terms of a proportion, grace is to salvation as wrath is to spiritual death.

> Thou judgest us: Thy purity
> Doth all our lusts condemn;
> The love that draws us nearer Thee
> Is hot with wrath to them.[13]

THE DATE OF CRUCIFIXION IN THE SYNOPTICS AND JOHN

By Uuras Saarnivaara

THE FACT that the day of Christ's crucifixion according to the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) seems to be the 15th of Nisan in the Jewish calendar, but according to John the day of preparation or the 14th of Nisan, has offered a difficult problem to New Testament interpretation. Aapeli Saarisalo, an internationally known Orientalist and expert on the archaeology of Palestine, now professor of Oriental Languages at the University of Helsinki, offers a solution of this problem on the basis of the difference between the Pharisaic and Sadducean calendars concerning the date of the celebration of the Passover meal. According to the interpretation given by Saarisalo, there is no real discrepancy between the Synoptics and John on the date of the Passover meal and the crucifixion.

According to the Jewish calendar, the day of crucifixion was the day which began on Thursday evening at sunset and ended on Friday evening at sunset. As already stated, according to the Synoptics this day was the 15th of Nisan or the first day of the actual Passover, whereas according to John it was the day of preparation or the 14th of Nisan:

Synoptics	*John*
"And the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and make ready that thou mayest eat the passover?" (Mark 14:12; cf. Matt. 26:17 and Luke 22:7.)	"Now before the feast of passover, Jesus knowing that his hour was come . . . during the supper . . ." (13: 1, 2).

All the Synoptics speak of the preparation of the Passover meal, but they do not mention the most important thing in it, the lamb, although they record all the other things, such as wine, unleavened bread, sauce. Matt. 26:30 also mentions

12 Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

13 J. G. Whittier, quoted in H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, C. J. Wright, *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, p. 796.

the singing of the Hallel-psalm. The institution of Holy Communion obviously took place in connection with the Passover meal.

According to John the Passover meal took place "before the Passover." The day could not have been the great sabbath; stores were then open, for Judas was supposed to go and buy what was needed for the feast (John 13:29). The servants of the high-priest came with lanterns, torches, and weapons to capture Jesus (John 18:3), and on the day of the crucifixion the Jews (the Sadducees) did not go into the judgment hall, lest they be defiled and prevented from eating the Passover (John 18:28). It was not permissible to carry weapons on the Sabbath day, and at the time of the crucifixion the eating of the Passover meal, at least in the case of the Sadducees, still lay ahead. John says three times (19:14, 31, 35) that it was the day of preparation, not the first Passover day or the great sabbath.

Jewish sources support the account of John. The first day of Passover was to the Pharisees a great sabbath. If the crucifixion had taken place on the first day of the Passover, as the Synoptics seem to put it, the Jews could not have done what the Gospels report them to have done without breaking the Sabbath. Even if the crucifixion of Jesus had been regarded as so urgent that even the Sabbath might be disregarded, the two evildoers would certainly not have been crucified on the day of a great sabbath, and it would have been supremely improbable even in the case of Jesus. Thus an irreconcilable discrepancy seems to exist between the reports of the Synoptics and John: according to the former Jesus was crucified on the first day of the Passover, and according to the latter, and also to Jewish literature, on the day of preparation. Since the record of John is in harmony with the known customs and traditions of the Jews, it can hardly be regarded as less reliable, as some scholars have.

When we study the Jewish Talmud, the apparent discrepancy is solved. The Sadducees always observed the first day of Pentecost on the first day of the week (our Sunday), and according to their calendar the first day of Passover, or the first day of the unleavened bread, was always on Saturday, or the Sabbath. They did so because they interpreted Lev. 23:11 as the weekly Sabbath, or Saturday, so that seven weeks, or forty-nine days plus one day, was the time between the first day of unleavened bread and the first day of Pentecost. They did so on the basis of Lev. 23:15.

The Pharisees, however, interpreted this Sabbath as a festival Sabbath, not necessarily as a weekly Sabbath, and it could fall on any day of the week, not necessarily on the weekly Sabbath.

In the year A.D. 30, when Jesus was crucified, the 15th of Nisan, counted according to the phases of the moon, was on Friday—in our calendar, April 7. The Pharisees and the majority of the people, including Jesus and his disciples, ate the Passover meal on Thursday night, whereas the Sadducees ate it on Friday night, or after the crucifixion of Jesus, as John says. Since the high-priest and the leaders of the people belonged to the Sadducees, they followed their own calendar (for which the Talmud, written by Pharisees, criticized them sharply, charging them with greed since they had the market open that day and performed

their everyday tasks). It was therefore quite proper for them to condemn and crucify Jesus on Friday. The Pharisees did not participate in it; the majority of them approved the act, but not the time when it was done.

This solves the apparent discrepancy between Luke 23:50 f. and Mark 14:64. Luke says that Joseph was a counselor, a member of the Sanhedrin, but he had not consented to their counsel and deed with regard to Jesus. But Mark states that "they all condemned him to be guilty of death." Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, who belonged to the Pharisaic party, were not present when Jesus was condemned, for they were at home eating the Passover meal. All those who were present (that is, the Sadducees) consented to the condemnation of Jesus.

The Sabbath of the calendar of the Pharisees started at sunset on Thursday night. When Judas left for business that was not permitted on a Sabbath, he separated himself from the spiritual Israel and joined the Sadducees, who still had a weekday. The plot between Judas and the Sadducees took place at the very time when leaven should have been purged out according to the calendar of the Sadducees. The Pharisaic Talmud calls Hannas and Caiaphas "hissing adders."

As we pointed out before, the evangelists do not mention the Passover lamb in speaking of the Passover meal, although some translations use a word that means the Passover lamb. The *pascha* of the Greek text means both the Passover lamb in particular and the Passover meal in general—and even the entire Passover festival. Here it is to be translated either by the word "Passover meal" or "Passover festival," depending on the context. The Passover lamb could not be eaten in the Passover meal of the Pharisees, or on Thursday night, for the killing of the lamb took place on Friday night, and the Sadducees controlled the temple. Thus only the Sadducees could eat Passover lamb—except for the years when the first day of the unleavened bread happened to be on the same day in both calendars. Already in the Maccabean period the Pharisees had become accustomed to do without the temple and the altar and to eat their Passover meal without the lamb, even in Jerusalem. This was the case everywhere outside of Jerusalem, for the Passover lamb could be killed only in the temple. The previous year, when Jesus was in Capernaum at Passover time, he had eaten the Passover meal without the lamb, and now he did the same because the lamb could not be killed on Thursday.

It appears even from the Synoptic Gospels that the Passover lamb was not actually killed on Thursday when Jesus and his disciples ate the meal. In Mark 14:12, "On the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover," the Greek text uses the imperfect tense (*pascha ethuon*), which means that it was the time when the lamb was usually sacrificed. In Luke 22:7 we read: "The day of unleavened bread, on which the passover must be sacrificed." The meaning is: The Passover lamb should have been killed at that time according to the law, as the Pharisees and the majority of the people interpreted it. However, because of the Sadducees, who had control over the temple, it could not be done, and so the Pharisees, Jesus, and his disciples ate the Passover meal without the lamb.

Thus there is no real discrepancy between the Synoptics and John on the dating of the events of Christ's passion. The discrepancy is merely apparent, and

is due to the fact that John follows the Sadducean calendar and the Synoptics the Pharisaic calendar in reporting these events. According to both, the Passover meal and the institution of Holy Communion took place on Thursday night and the crucifixion on Friday. The latter was in the Pharisaic calendar the first day of the unleavened bread, in the Sadducean calendar the day of preparation.

The question arises: Why did John follow the Sadducean calendar and so create this seeming discrepancy between his own account and that of the Synoptics, which he obviously knew? The probable reason is that he wanted to point out that Jesus died at the very time the Passover lamb was actually sacrificed in the temple, on Friday afternoon. The Synoptics do not show this, but Paul presents the same thought in I Cor. 5:7: "For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ." When Paul says in I Cor. 15:20, "But now Christ is risen from the dead, the first fruit of them that are asleep," he seems to imply that the resurrection of Jesus took place at the very time when the sheaf of the first fruits was waved in the temple (Lev. 23:10-11).

OUR SO-CALLED HOUSES OF PRAYER

By Granger Westberg

NOT SO LONG ago I found myself in a city with two hours to waste between trains. As I walked about the town I came upon a beautiful Lutheran church and thought how good it would be to have my morning devotions there. I tried the front door, but found it locked. The side door was too. Since I still wanted to get in, I went around to the back door and there happened to meet the sexton. I asked him if it would be all right if I went into the church for a few minutes.

"Did you want to see something there?" he asked.

"No, I just thought I'd like to go in and spend a few minutes in the church."

But he could not comprehend what I might want to do there, so he asked, "Have you seen our new stained glass windows?" Well, I had not, and so the next twenty minutes were spent on a conducted tour of the church. With pride he pointed out the new windows and the new pipe organ and included all the financial details. No praying was done in that church that morning.

How often have you seen anyone sitting in your church praying—on a Tuesday, that is, or a Wednesday or a Friday? And yet Jesus said, "My house shall be a house of prayer." Is your church really "the house of prayer" in your community, or is it more like an auditorium where people go only when there is a program?

I know that all of you have thought about this many, many times. I can picture you on a Monday morning as you go into your church just to sit down and pray and think about the things that happened on Sunday. You unlock the front door and go in. You are all alone in this unusual place. You pray and you meditate.

Everything is so quiet and still. Somehow today it seems even more like a house of prayer than it did yesterday.

You find yourself thinking, "My prayer time this morning has been helped immensely by these surroundings. Why should this church be locked up so that no one can use it all week long? It just does not seem right to have it open only an hour a week. I am sure the people would find this house of prayer a real haven of refuge where they could come and look at their problems in an entirely different setting. I find that as I sit here, away from other distractions, that the Holy Spirit has a better chance of giving me insights which I would not take time for on the outside. This house is different from all other buildings. It does something to me."

You and I know very well that we do not grow spiritually unless we take time for meditation. Even in our studies, which have become offices these days, we find it hard to keep our minds fixed on God because we are reminded by the desk and the typewriter and the mimeograph of the many unfinished tasks before us. Frequently our devotional life is pushed off to one side because of the many pressures which demand our attention.

If we who are clergymen have difficulty finding a time and a suitable place for such necessary devotional periods, then what about our people? We might be appalled if we knew how little time our people spend listening to the still small voice. This is partly our fault as ministers because we do not teach our people how to be still and how to listen to the voice of God. Because we permit our churches to be locked all week, we are in effect saying to our people that we do not think there is any value in such periods of contemplation in a place set aside for that purpose.

And, further, on Sunday morning when they come for worship we give them almost no time for quiet contemplation. We keep the service going, going all the time. There must be no breaks, no pauses. Somebody must be speaking or the organ must be playing every moment. Our people are often so busy just keeping up with what is going on in the service that they have little or no time for what worship should include—self-examination, meditation, contemplation, moving on up to a sense of awe and wonder in the presence of the living God. But in order to have this happen we need periods of silence. Yet we scarcely know what silences are. We think of them as disturbing or awkward. Our people become uneasy about them, and rightly so because they are usually unplanned. The Quaker speaks of two kinds of silence: dead silence (unplanned) and living silence, where all hearts are electrified by the spirit of prayer. And what a difference there is! In the typical Lutheran service there are practically no opportunities for private prayer. The minister does all the praying for the people. And when they are to pray, we ask the people to stand up rather than kneel, and then we put that prayer at the poorest psychological moment of the service—just before they put their hats and coats on to leave.

Perhaps the word "worship" is not the proper word to describe what happens on Sunday morning in our churches. Despite our liturgical order, we can detect

in most of our services an atmosphere not unlike that of a high school commencement program. Both have in common an opening Scripture and prayer, a vocal solo or an anthem by a choir, an inspirational address, a prayer and a benediction. The people fit the role of audience rather than congregation, and what happens is pretty much like what takes place in auditoriums anywhere.

The morning service should be unlike anything a person will attend in a hall or auditorium at any other time of the week. The service does not compete with any form of entertainment. The worship experience should create a feeling that we have been in touch with something outside of this world. Therefore, it should be of no consequence who is going to preach or sing or play. In such a setting it is incongruous to use some of the mannerisms of a concert hall and pass out programs to people as they enter. This is not a program. The interest a potential worshiper may take in the program (or bulletin) in his hand may cause it to stand between him and the Object of his worship. The chief purpose of the bulletin is to keep parishioners informed about coming events of interest. Such a bulletin can much better be given the worshiper as he leaves the church when he can give it his whole attention.

People are these days begging us to help them feel the presence of God in their lives. The liturgical service can create a "this world in relation to the eternal" atmosphere. It can lift us above the ordinary things of life so that our perspective is not limited by the material things which usually distract us. If we think of it as more than just a springboard for the sermon, it can become, in any parish church, an even better vehicle for creating an awareness of God's presence in the here and now. For centuries the liturgy of the church has helped man break through the ceiling of the material world. It is foolish for us, therefore, to take this liturgy, which has been so helpful in getting man's attention off himself, and change it so as to mimic the earth-bound, man-centered type program of the entertainment world.

How can we better lead people into the presence of God? We want to do everything possible to deepen the lives of our parishioners. With this in mind there are two questions we should ask ourselves: (1) Is my church really being used as a house of prayer for the people of our community? (2) Does my Sunday service really offer opportunity for worship, which necessarily means time for meditation and personal prayer?

Suppose you say, "No, I have to admit that my church is never used by people for private prayer." "No, I have to admit that my Sunday service still resembles a program more than a God-entered worship experience." What can we do about it? Here are a few brief comments on what we might be able to do.

1. Try having your church open daily for prayer for a period of one year. Inasmuch as most adults will feel self-conscious about being "caught" praying in the church, inaugurate an educational program for children on how to use the devotional materials you place in the pews. You may be surprised how quickly children take to the idea of going into the church for prayer. They may actually lead adults to a new appreciation of the church as a place of prayer.

2. Share your own daily devotional period with your people. That is, let it be known that a short period of devotion and prayer is conducted in the church every day of the week at a certain time, and that people are invited to join you. This may help to break down the idea that we worship God only on Sundays. It may also give opportunity for those who must work on Sundays to enter the house of God on another day of the week. When the pastor is out of town laymen can well be asked to lead this devotional period. They will find it a simple yet wonderful experience to conduct such devotions where the accent is on Scripture, prayer, and silent meditation.

3. Examine your Sunday service with some ruthlessness, having some of the following questions in mind: (a) Does my outdoor bulletin board blare forth *my* name and *my* Sunday sermon topic, thereby accenting the lecture or human aspects of worship? (b) Do the ushers pass out programs as if a concert were about to begin? (c) Is there any really good reason why my people should not kneel for prayer? (d) Does the chancel of my church have a cluttered look because of the organ pipes, organ console, piano, choir chairs, and choristers and thereby diminish the beauty and centrality of the altar as the focus of worship? (e) Do the children of my church (over six years of age) participate in a service in the sanctuary every Sunday so that they come to feel "at home" in the church? (f) Is there ample opportunity given within the service itself for meditation and prayer?

Life and Thought in World Lutheranism[1]

Discussion of Eternal Life and Immortality in Denmark

The event in Danish church life which overshadowed all others during the past year was the controversy about eternal life which was precipitated by an address given by P. G. Lindhardt, professor of Church History in the University of Aarhus. He shocked and challenged the church people of Denmark by his re-appraisal, according to a socio-economic interpretation, of church developments in the nineteenth century. Reacting against his own pietistic background, Lindhardt has been devastating in his criticisms of past and current religious movements. His own theology has been shaped by his critical training and by the current demythologizing influences from Germany. It is based, however, on a genuine faith and a Nicene Christology. In many ways he is a burr under the saddle of established forms, as was Kierkegaard a century ago. His keen analysis, his ready wit, and his incisive arguments make him a natural polemicist.

Irked by the fuzzy thinking within the church which substituted pagan philosophies of immortality, traditional folk-lore, and wishful thinking for the Christian teaching of resurrection, Lindhardt tore such preaching apart and presented a radical, but essentially sound, doctrine of eternal life. (One wonders to what heights he would have risen if he had been acquainted with high-power American mortuarians!) His main contention was that we know nothing about an immortal life; all we know is that there is an eternal life with God through faith in Jesus Christ. Lindhardt made the mistake, however, of overdoing his legitimate emphasis and of proclaiming that there is no future life, only an eternal present life. His demythologizing of the Christian hope and his arbitrary treatment of the New Testament was so extreme that considerable opposition was aroused. Most theologians agreed with Lindhardt's main thesis, but many attacked his extreme expressions and his polemical attitude, claiming that he battled against straw-men of his own construction and that he created confusion by his shocking expressions. The general public had difficulty in distinguishing between theological subtleties, and it became aroused against what was considered to be an attack on faith in "life after death." There can be no doubt, however, that the discussion aroused a great deal of interest in a vital problem and that it will eventually help clear the air. It also brought home to the

1 With this number The Lutheran Quarterly is inaugurating a new feature. Occasional reports of significant events in the life and thought of Lutheran churches throughout the world will be made by observers, whose purpose it will be to record some of the things that are currently of concern to fellow Lutherans and to interpret and appraise them for readers in North America.—The Editors.

clergy that they have an obligation to make the *kerygma* clear to the man in the pew who has become lethargic under the influence of intellectualistic discussions from the pulpit. Besides, it suggested that men like Lindhardt must learn to accentuate the positive.

An accentuation of the positive has been made in the work of Lindhardt's internationally known colleague, Regin Prenter, professor of Systematic Theology at Aarhus, who has completed his Dogmatics, *Skabelse og Genløsning* (620 pages, G. E. C. Gads Forlag, 1953). Prenter is known for his *Spiritus Creator,* recently published in translation by the Muhlenberg Press in Philadelphia, and for his chairmanship of the theological department of the Lutheran World Federation. He is a profound Luther scholar who has also been deeply influenced by Grundtvig, and he has brought the insights of both of these earlier men to bear on his modern examination of Christian doctrine. Prenter's book is a strongly Christ-centered presentation which develops the theme suggested by the title (Creation and Reconciliation), namely, that there is a vital and important connection between God's great acts of creation and reconciliation.

Three tragic deaths have almost ravaged the core of the theological faculty at the University of Copenhagen. All three of the men who died—Aage Bentzen, professor of the Old Testament, Holger Mosbech, professor of the New Testament, and Jens Nørregaard, professor of Church History—began their university careers in the early twenties, and they are known beyond the boundaries of their country for their scholarly contributions. Professor Nørregaard was also known for his staunch leadership of the university when he was rector during the trying years of the Nazi occupation. The burden of that task undoubtedly contributed to his untimely death.

J. Knudsen

Debate About Hell in Norway

The past year was distinguished by a stirring discussion about eternal life and eternal damnation. Religious discussions in Norway are carried on in the daily press, especially in the two Christian dailies, *Dagen* and *Vaart Land,* but also in the secular press, especially *Aftenposten,* a leading Oslo newspaper.

The occasion, as far as Norway is concerned, was the following warning issued in a radio broadcast by the well-known Christian leader, Professor O. Hallesby: "I am sure I am speaking to many this evening who know they are unconverted. You know that if you fell dead to the floor this moment, you would plunge right to hell." Hallesby was professor at the independent theological faculty and, until lately, president of the large national Inner Mission League.

About the same time a controversy about eternal life arose in Denmark (see above). The discussions merged into a general debate about the reality of eternal life and eternal damnation. In Denmark the emphasis has been on eternal life, in Norway on eternal damnation. In Norway a storm of protests arose against "scaring people into Christianity by threats of hell." Kristian Scheldrup, bishop at Hamar, sided

with the critics of Hallesby. He claimed that "Jesus never intended to establish an objective doctrine of eternal hell," and announced that "for me the doctrine of eternal punishment is not at home in a religion of love."

Scheldrup has had a very remarkable career in the Church of Norway. As a theological student he belonged to the extreme liberals. He continued his studies for some time after graduation. Feeling that he belonged in the church, he applied for one of the poorest charges in northern Norway. But his reputation for radicalism was so well known that not even a liberal government dared to appoint him to any position in the church. His connection with the Nansen Institute for humanistic studies at Bergen enabled him to continue his studies in the history and philosophy of religion until he suffered a change of heart, was converted, and became an evangelical Christian, and, while confined in a concentration camp, he practiced soul-care extensively among his fellow-prisoners. Released, he became an evangelist and gained a good standing with conservative Christians. After a very brief experience in the ministry he was appointed bishop of Hamar. His is one of the most meteoric careers in the Church of Norway. He is distinguished by wideness of heart rather than by clarity of mind.

During the debate pro and con that followed, Dr. Hallesby's supporters called attention to the fact that the doctrine of eternal torment for the wicked is based on Jesus' own words and is "unmistakably stated" in the Augsburg Confession (Art. 17). Hallesby and his friends also charged that Bishop Scheldrup had broken his ordination vow.

Bishop Scheldrup demanded a ruling from the Department of Church and Education, which under the king and his council is the administrative agency of the church. He declared that he could not continue as bishop in the church if he was "outside the confession." The fact that the appeal was made to a governmental agency instead of to the council of bishops illustrates an anomalous situation in the Church of Norway and explains why, from the 1870's to the last failure in 1953, attempts have been made to secure more self-government for the church and greater independence over against the state.

The Department submitted the question to its legal advisor, Professor Frede Castberg, to the bishops, and to the two theological faculties.

Castberg reported that the constitution of the country declares that the established religion is to be Evangelical Lutheran but that it says nothing about Confessions. From this fact the professor concluded that the Confessions cannot be given a narrow, literal interpretation. He stated that a certain broadness and liberality in their interpretation is in line with the history of the Church of Norway, and that the Confessions do not involve a legal obligation to preach what is contrary to one's convictions. He also added that the king in council gives laws and regulations for the Church of Norway, that he is not obliged to seek the advice of the bishops, though it is usually done, and that only a court can deprive a clergyman of his office. This did not quiet troubled waters. One wonders

how a case involving the Confessions would stand up in court if they have no legally binding character. Bishop Berggrav in an article in *For kirke og kultur* maintains that Lutheranism does not demand a "legalistically literal interpretation of historic Confessions" but that Lutherans must remain faithful to "the principles of the doctrine of faith."

Two of the bishops, Smemo and Indrebö, together with the independent theological faculty, declared outright that Scheldrup's statements are contrary to the Confessions. The other bishops, together with the university faculty, declared that there is not sufficient material on hand on which to base a judgment, that what exists is confused and contradictory, and that it does not furnish sufficient basis for exclusion. They are of the opinion that Bishop Scheldrup has not departed from the Confessions sufficiently to regard him as being outside the church. Bishop Berggrav in the aforementioned article stated that Bishop Scheldrup "has not set himself outside the church but on the outer fringe of the church's fellowship." Several of the bishops emphasized strongly the importance of Confessional loyalty; and some, notably Fjellbu, pointed out the grave seriousness of the two alternatives, eternal life and eternal damnation. Fjellbu stressed that a yielding to a soft sentimentalism on this point would do irreparable harm to the contents and the earnestness of the Christian message.

The university faculty implied that it is necessary to distinguish between the biblical message and its historically conditioned form; also, that Jesus Christ shared and took for granted many ideas of his time, which are not always to be taken literally. (Do we here have the shades of Bultmann or the ghost of the old rationalistic accommodation theory?)

The Department in its final decision pointed to essential differences of understanding among the experts and declared that the bishop is not outside the church's confession. This, together with the failure of a new attempt to get more freedom and self-government for the church, has created a deep disappointment among the Christian people of Norway and a certain tenseness in church-state relations. This time a new constitution for the church was sponsored by the Labor government itself. The proposition was first watered down and made qiute innocuous by the government and then presented to the *Storting* (parliament) as a government measure. It was nevertheless voted down by the majority party. Grasping for power was given as a reason. By whom? Perhaps the bishops. A sop was, however, thrown to the church. The diocesan councils are to be permitted to have a joint meeting once in four years. Quite a concession! There is no general church council outside the council of bishops.

The disappointment and tenseness in church-state relationship is reflected by a series of articles written by Bishop Smemo of Oslo and published in the Christian daily, *Vaart Land,* in January. Besides the two matters mentioned, the bishop also referred to the policy the government has pursued aiming at the elimination of the influence of the church in the schools. He recalled that a few years ago the

government took over the Oslo Teachers' College, built and supported by the Inner Mission movement. The intention seems to be to make teacher training uniform and to secure complete government control over education. The Labor party here seems to have taken a leaf from the notebook of the dictators. Attempts have also been made to eliminate pastors as ex-officio members of school boards and guardianship councils. The bishop stated that mutual distrust is growing and that the state-church relationship is increasingly tense. He even intimates the possibility of a separation between church and state.

In his review of church life Bishop Smemo mentioned poor church attendance. A large portion of the population, while nominally members, seldom or never go to church, and outsiders seldom are found in the Inner Mission chapels. One of the disheartening things about the recent controversy about hell, according to Smemo, is that it reveals that large numbers of people do not feel under obligation to confess a teaching contained in the Confessions of the church and in Christ's own words, who think the controversy was simply a part of the fight for freedom of thought, and who demand room in the church for whatever our time may accept as religious truth.

On the credit side of the ledger the bishop cited the large number of listeners to the Christian radio (about 50% of the population) and also the generally friendly feeling that prevails among the people, and as a rule also among those in authority, toward the church. Since the war 150 churches have been restored. A number have also been redecorated or restored to their original architecture. A vigorous program is being pushed to reach the unchurched multitudes by building many small churches in the cities, since a few large ones have proved to be ineffective. This is sponsored in Oslo by the Inner Mission movement. The new housing areas are also being provided for.

In the 1920's the controversy was about the Apostles' Creed. Now it appears to be about the Augsburg Confession. Meanwhile the old-fashioned liberalism, at least in its Ritschlian form, has died. As the former liberals became more conservative, there was a joining of hands under the stress of war in 1940. Profession of loyalty to the Scriptures and to the Confessions is now quite common on both sides. And yet there is a difference in attitude. One party wants a liberal interpretation of the Confessions, the other a stricter and more literal interpretation. Liberalism has become much more orthodox, but it is still liberal. Of late a graduate of the independent faculty, Reidar Hauge, has been appointed professor at the university as Professor Ording's successor. Nevertheless, the two groups are drifting apart.

The ecumenical question has been debated vigorously the past year. It started as a result of a lecture at the general pastoral conference about Norway's participation in the World Council of Churches. The lecture was by Carl Fredrik Wislöff, rector of the seminary for practical theology attached to the independent faculty. It seems that Norway was brought into the World Council by its bishops, and

the action has been challenged by a considerable number. Wislöff's lecture amounted to a definite "no" to the question of Norway's participation. Bishop Berggrav's reply was a just as definite "yes." As a result of the debate, which was continued during the year, a much livelier interest in the ecumenical question has arisen. Another result is the proposal from the Norwegian bishops, which will be put before the Evanston convention, that the statement of the constitution of the council that the World Council of Churches is "a fellowship of churches that accept Jesus Christ as God and Saviour," be changed by substituting the word "confess" instead of "accept" and inserting the word "according to the Scriptures" before "confess."

An ultra-Confessional faction seems to have arisen within the orthodox-Confessional party. Their slogan is a return to the theology of the Reformation, with stress on the antithesis "sin and grace" and man's total inability in matters of salvation, in place of the antithesis "nature and grace" and a point of contact in human nature, which, they claim, has characterized later Lutheranism. They are doughty warriors who want to eliminate something. What they want to eliminate is not clear. Perhaps all that has happened since the Formula of Concord. One may guess that it is the Pietistic influence they want to destroy.

The people they attack include most of those who for a generation have fought for a Confessional theology. The old-time Confessionalists charge the upstarts with a one-sided emphasis on the Confessions to the neglect of Scriptures. They maintain that the Confessions must be interpreted by Scriptures, and not Scriptures by the Confessions. This charge should be familiar to us on this side of the ocean. The matter came to public attention in connection with a doctoral thesis by Leiv Aalen on Zinzendorf's theology. Dr. Aalen is Hallesby's successor at the independent faculty. The Norwegians take doctor's disputations seriously, and sometimes they set off controversies. This one touches a sensitive point in Norwegian church life because of the important role Pietism has played. A young enthusiast is reported to have gone so far as to brand the man who for a generation has been the leader against liberal theology, Dr. O. Hallesby, as a liberal because he, besides the objective basis of Christianity, also recognizes a subjective element. Dr. Hallesby's theology resembles that of the Erlangen school.

A lecture given by Pastor Martin Tveter at the joint meeting of Christian organizations at Gjeilo (January, 1954) may have some connection with this. Pastor Tveter called for the consolidation of Christians in Norway with Christians in other Nordic countries on the foundation of the church and what in Norway is called "awakening Christianity." He called for "actualization" of the message of the Reformation with a clear distinction between Law and Gospel. He presented these demands, not only with the recent debate about hell in mind, but also, as he says, in view of certain tendencies in recent theology. He demanded a theological and practical settlement between Pietistically oriented preaching and Neo-orthodox, anti-

Pietistic, and anti-revival theology and preaching. Yet he recognized that current preaching needs a corrective in the light of the evangelical ideas in Luther.

IVER IVERSEN

CHURCH AND STATE IN GERMANY

When Bishop Otto Dibelius and other representatives of the regional churches reached an agreement with the government of the German Democratic Republic on June 10, 1953, the second major encounter of this generation between church and state leveled off into an uneasy peace. Any evaluation of this struggle must take into account that the Soviet German state, like any other Communist state, is the sole guarantor of man's rights, for there are no natural rights on the basis of which man can criticize or withstand such a totalitarian state. This means, first, that the articles of the East German political constitutions which guarantee religious freedom to the churches are necessarily limited, such guarantees being subordinate to a state which embodies all lawful authority in its own entity. It means, next, that any challenge of such a concept of the state must be made promptly, before the new order is completely settled and beyond modification. Therefore, with courage and persistence, the church acted when its freedom was violated.

Chief target of the Communist attack was the *Junge Gemeinde,* far-flung parish centered youth work of the East German Lutheran churches. Caught in the same Red net was the *Evangelische Studentengemeinde,* vital Christian student work at the many universities and technical schools. The main charge against these church agencies was that they were "tools of the capitalist-imperialist West."

Tension between East Germany's churchmen and the Communist leaders had been mounting since 1948. In 1952 it became severe and reached its peak in the spring of 1953. Among the eighty arrested pastors, professors, and others was Johannes Hamel, popular and courageous pastor for students at the University of Halle. While the faithful in nearly every parish were being tested, the churches stood solidly together, not in their own interests so much as in behalf of the thousands of people who, under a totalitarian regime more sinister than that of the Nazis, had no other spokesman.

Suddenly a change came. On July 10, 1953, an agreement was reached between the East German churches and the government of the German Democratic Republic. The following is a summary from the full text in *Die Evangelische Welt* (July 1, 1953, pp. 348-349):

1. No further measures are to be taken by the government against the *Junge Gemeinde,* the church's youth work.

2. All students dropped from secondary schools are to be received back and to be given an opportunity to take their examinations.

3. All students dropped from the universities because of membership in the Christian Student Congregation are to be given an opportunity for reinstatement.

4. The Ministry of Public Education is to work out immediately a basic policy as well as plans for regulating the use of public school premises for Christian education on an extra-curricular basis.

5. Requisitioned church property, includ-

ing welfare institutions, youth centers, and the like, are to be returned.

6. The churches and the government will cooperate in the use by young people of church-owned summer camps and resorts on the Baltic Sea.

7. Sentences imposed on currently imprisoned pastors and laymen are to be reviewed and injustices corrected.

8. Regulations requiring application for church-sponsored activities for children and young people are to be reviewed and needlessly stringent requirements abrogated.

9. Government subsidies to the churches are to be paid according to the provisions set forth in the regulations agreed upon.

The agreement of June 10 was an unexpected but welcome respite in a struggle whose end was likely to remain far off. Indeed, the people's uprising against the whole Red regime on and after June 17 put the agreement with the churches into jeopardy. The East German [DDR] government nevertheless permitted an unprecedented 16,000 active Christians to visit the huge Evangelical Congress [*Kirchentag*] in Hamburg in August. Early in 1954 the outward peace was still in force, but there were signs that pressures were being applied to individuals rather than to groups or to top leaders.

East German Lutherans, meanwhile, had learned from this conflict. Their congregational life would have to be strengthened. The training of catechists and the whole program of Christian education would have to be intensified. Every opportunity would have to be utilized for developing a sense of partnership and responsibility among the members. Theologically, as the Lutheran *Kirchenzeitung* observed, the Reformation doctrine of the two kingdoms would continue to be on trial in Red Germany for some time to come. Yet this doctrine appeared to remind the people of what they needed most, "the conviction that they are children of God, and not mere numbers . . . or means of production."

For churches like those in Saxony, Thuringia, Mecklenberg, and elsewhere in the DDR, 1953 marked the completion of two decades of a struggle for survival against the cynical forces of a modern state. Many interpreted these forces as demonic. Yet, arrayed against these, the churches experienced God's sustaining and redeeming power. In geographic regions where resistance to Nazi neo-paganism had once been weak, there had come new resources of spiritual strength since 1945. Many among the thousands of Silesian and East Prussian refugees, despite their abject poverty, had brought a rich and fructifying faith into communities which had given them settlement. Lessons learned by pastors and people in opposing Nazism were now being applied with courage, hope, and daring faith. Nor has the truth escaped them that the worst enemy is the enemy within—the temptation to capitulate thoughtlessly, as all too many East Germans have done, to a glittering but poisonous solution to their problems. Meanwhile, ties between Christians in East and West Germany continued to be strengthened by intercessory prayer, by a limited amount of fraternal visitation, and by the steady flow from West to East of thousands of little material relief packages—all of them signs of the Spirit uniting brethren.

Bultmann's Demythologization

The past year saw West Germany troubled with tensions from within, mainly in terms of the controversy over the alleged or real danger of Rudolf Bultmann's demythologizing of the New Testament. With theological pronouncements bright enough to draw a response, the retired Marburg professor did not, however, ring true enough to inspire confidence. While attracting many young pastors and students, he remained incomprehensible to most who had already become set in their theological ways. Meanwhile, Friedrich Gogarten, dynamic professor of Systematic Theology at Göttingen, came in on Bultmann's side and widened the controversy to include the field of intellectual history.

Ranged against these demythologizers were most of the church administrations. Theological faculties at the University of Tübingen and at the Bethel-Bielefeld Seminary made fair-minded pronouncements against Bultmann and his friends. Yet within the Evangelical Church in Germany [EKD] it remained for the Bishops' Conference of the United Lutheran Church in Germany [VELKD] to issue an official warning. This declaration, as published in *Die Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (Dec. 1, 1953, p. 361) was read publicly in the churches on the last Sunday of the 1953 church year:

"Fear not, I am the first and the last, and the living one. I died, and behold I am alive forevermore, and I have the keys of death and hell" (Rev. 1:17-18).

The mighty message of this Sunday is none other than one of death and resurrection. We Christians are a waiting people. We wait for the return of our Lord Jesus Christ who, as he is risen from the dead, will return in glory "to judge both the quick and the dead" (II Tim. 4:1). In face of the transitoriness of human life, we wait for him who will awaken us to eternal life. We wait for him to establish his reign over this wretched and needy world which has fallen away from him; "according to his promise we wait for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (II Peter 3:13).

This is the very heart of our faith, and this remains the center of our message which is founded on the fact that he lives. It is the task of the church to proclaim this message to all the world, to bear witness to it at all times, and to convey it to every people in every age in their own language and thought ways.

In this regard anxiety has arisen within the church itself during recent years. Several theological teachers, seeking new ways of making the heart of the biblical message comprehensible to our contemporaries, are in danger of diminishing or losing the content of that message in the process of what they call a "demythologizing" of the New Testament. These teachers see that the expressions of the New Testament are clothed in ancient thought ways. Yet we must ask them whether [in their attempt to restate meanings] they may not be denying facts to which the Scriptures testify.

For the church it is an urgent task to carry on a discussion with these teachers of theology. Therefore churchmen in administrative positions, in universities and seminaries, are in constant scholarly discussion with the representatives of that new viewpoint in order to safeguard the purity of Christian doctrine.

More than that, we summon our congregations: Let us hold fast to our confession of Jesus Christ as the incarnate, crucified, and risen Lord who lives and rules at the right hand of the Father and who will come again in glory. In the Apostles' Creed the church has borne witness from century to century to this historic act of God, and it continues to do so prayerfully and publicly Sunday after Sunday.

This confession will give us power to make our way confidently, despite a life of trouble and suffering. In the power of this confession we know that our labor is not in vain in the Lord. In the power of this confession we are permitted, in our final burdened hour, to commit ourselves into God's hands.

"If we live, we live to the Lord, and if we die, we die to the Lord; so then, whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ died and lived again that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living" (Rom. 14:8-9).

While Bultmann had been preoccupied with the New Testament, Gogarten in his *Entmytholigisierung und Kirche* (Stuttgart, 1953) applied demythological principles to the history of Christian thought. From New Testament hermeneutics he extended attention to the quest for meaning in history, a quest which included the historicism of Ernst Troeltsch and the existentialism of Martin Heidegger. His main thesis is this: the true intentions of the New Testament (and of Luther) can only then be properly understood and correctly conveyed when one thinks consistently in the vein of modern historical thought, wherein being and reality are understood historically—that is, as existence within time. Gogarten, like Bultmann, insists that his interpretations convey the real meaning of the New Testament writers; that everything learned about God is also something learned about man; that, thanks to modern historical insights, it is possible to overcome the distortions of the New Testament message which have been caused by medieval philosophy and its accompanying dogmas and sacramentalism.

Among Lutheran theologians, Professor Ernst Kinder, at Münster, has insisted that the rapport which Bultmann, Gogarten, and others claim with the New Testament writers rests on a subjective basis closely akin to the illusory "objectivity" of theological liberalism. Yet the problem is complicated by the fact that the Bultmannites have coined their own theological meanings and thus actually speak a different language than the conventional Evangelical theologians. This element of semantic uncertainty thus tends to corrupt a fruitful theological discussion into bitter feud in which the sincerity of both sides is apparent, while the ultimate end of demythologizing—the rediscovery of truth—achieves no great affirmation but rather profound frustration. The irony of this situation becomes apparent in the anxiety of the conservative Lutherans. Lacking leadership in the New Testament field comparable to Bultmann, they seem handicapped in expressing a faith which is profoundly felt yet ecclesiastically too traditional to speak with full relevance to the condition of modern man.

German Inter-Church Relations

Inter-church relations, meanwhile, engaged the VELKD in a continuing discussion with the EKD on the one hand, and with the Lutheran Free Churches on the other. Within the EKD the chief area of tension lay in relation to the organizationally resurgent Old Prussian Union, recently renamed the Evangelical Church of the Union [EKU]. This federation, counterbalancing the VELKD, includes a strong block of regional churches,

among them Berlin-Brandenburg, the Province of Saxony, Westphalia, and the Rhineland, with a friendly fringe of churches including Hesse and the Palatinate. The revived EKU provides another ecclesiastical bond between East and West Germany, a fact borne out also by the popularized slogan of President Wilm, of the Westphalian Church, calling for "the silent reunification of Germany." While the nationalistic note is thus present, the confessional note is minimized.

This failure of the churches constituting the EKU to recover the confessional loyalties surrendered in the Union of 1817 has been a source of disappointment to the VELKD. For the policy of the latter had been to dissolve unionism and regain confessional purity among both Lutherans and Reformed. During the past year, therefore, the VELKD repeated the conviction that tensions would be eased all around if all parties would accept the EKD for what its constitution declares it to be: "The Evangelical Church in Germany is a federation of Lutheran, Reformed, and Union Churches." Conversely, those outside the VELKD have charged the confessionally-minded Lutherans with absolutizing their own position and with failing to admit that the EKD can also be more than a mere federation. Württemberg's Bishop Martin Haug, successor of Bishop Theophil Wurm (who died at the end of January, 1953), and others have endeavored to reconcile an array of differences between the Lutheran leaders and the rest. These include the perennial difficulties between the president of the Church of Hesse, Martin Niemoeller, and the presiding bishop of the VELKD, Hans Meiser. Yet behind such matters lie long-term theological differences like the unresolved Protestant dilemma over the doctrine of the church, the Lutheran versus the Reformed understanding of the Lord's Supper, and the again critical issue of altar fellowship across confessional lines, reaffirmed this year for all congregations in the churches of the EKU. The presence of considerable numbers of Lutheran refugees on union church territory continues to aggravate the problem of altar fellowship. Meanwhile, the study conferences of the reconstituted and widely significant Theological Convention of the Augsburg Confession—whose membership includes such leading theologians as Dean Hans Asmussen, of Kiel, and Professor Edmund Schlink, of Heidelberg—has been fostering a sense of purpose among Lutherans within and beyond the VELKD.

While the VELKD has appeared narrow to some, it has continued to appear too broad to others, notably to the Lutheran Free Churches. Small as the latter are numerically, they are nevertheless influential both in terms of their ties with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and in terms of their rugged stewardship of faith and life. Thus they stand out as an example of Lutheranism freed from its ancient bondage to the political government (still true in finance, and partly so in education) and potentially able to complete the challenge of the Reformation. In church finance, however, Württemberg—not a member of the VELKD—has made the boldest move in venturing to support

its ecclesiastical needs with voluntary contributions instead of tax-gathered funds. This year saw further gains, although the ways of this kind of stewardship call for the utmost in faith and resourcefulness.

For the Germans this year was marked by a follow-up on the Hanover Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation. The Germans appeared grateful for their share in the new program of Lutheran World Service, counting the American representatives as "the best interpreters of our situation to friends abroad" as well as ready helpers in meeting the needs of refugees and other groups requiring special assistance. Thus the ideal of continuing international team work within and beyond the Lutheran fellowship has gained further acceptance, even though there are still misunderstandings as to the proper relationship between Lutheran World Service, on the one hand, and the Inner Mission and the Evangelical *Hilfswerk* on the other. Since Hanover, moreover, Germany's Lutherans have responded increasingly in their support of the whole program of the LWF. The amazing economic recovery of West Germany during this year has obviously been a contributing factor in this direction. But with it has also returned a remarkable amount of theological and other church activity which is likely to influence both world Lutheranism and the ecumenical movement—all of which is notably personified by Hanover's Bishop Hanns Lilje, president of the LWF.

Faith and Life in Germany

Developments in other areas included the huge Evangelical Congress [*Kirchentag*], held August 12-16 in Hamburg. Under the arresting theme, "Do not throw away your confidence" (Heb. 10:35), nearly a quarter of a million men, women, and young people from all parts of Germany, besides many visitors from abroad, moved in on this Lutheran metropolis and, among other things, delivered a missionary challenge to its spiritually fallow masses. Under the able direction of Dr. Reinold von Thadden-Trieglaff, the *Kirchentag* has become one of the most dramatic expressions in postwar Germany of how a soundly evangelical faith may be effectively linked to the everyday life of a people. The succession of these annual gatherings in Hanover (1949), Essen (1950), Berlin (1951), Stuttgart (1952), and Hamburg help to signalize the return of lay participation in the life of the church, and also the recovery of the concept of the Christian fellowship as open to all.

A new sense of political responsibility among Protestants became evident in the West German general elections on September 6, when Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and the Christian Democratic political forces scored an unprecedented victory. One of the noteworthy political facts since 1945 has been the partnership of Catholics and Protestants in a middle-of-the-road party. In the September election the Protestant proportion in that party rose to 38%. The strategic switch to Adenauer and the CDU came largely in predominantly Lutheran areas like Hamburg, Hanover, Schleswig-Holstein, and Hesse. With a better internal balance the "Christian

front" seemed likely to endure for some time, as well as to forestall any possible confessional feuds. Seldom, however, has the term Christian been placed in so great jeopardy by political identification. West Germany's future, including rearmament and European unity and much more besides, has been delivered into the hands of a government whose "Christian" label would demand the highest type of statesmanship and whose failures, if and when they came, would be charged against the church, if not against the Christian faith itself. Thus the possibility, at least, for a disillusionment of the masses in the Christian faith has been prepared by the very success which the churches have at the moment achieved. While many Germans have learned to flourish better as a torso than as a complete national body, the irony of the present situation is inescapable and the conditions of a prolonged divided existence unsatisfactory. For Germany's Lutherans, nearly half of whom are in the East under Red control, the overall situation may indeed grow worse before it can grow better.

E. Theodore Bachmann

Microfilms of American Lutheranism

Early Lutheran imprints are relatively rare items which have on this account been inaccessible to many historians. News of the appearance of microfilm reproductions of some of these American items will therefore be welcome.

The microfilm project was initiated in 1951 by Martin Graebner, Synodical Conference pastor to students at the University of Chicago, and Robert Wiederaenders, private student in history at the University and now American Lutheran Church pastor in Oak Lawn, Ill. These men began with the assumption that the movement known as American Lutheranism "has always been English, conservative, and democratic." They were frustrated in their attempt to investigate the validity of this thesis by want of pertinent sources, and so they set about assembling materials in microfilm copies. The University of Chicago Libraries sponsored the undertaking, their department of photographic reproduction secured the microfilms, and the work was financed by sale of subscriptions. It was decided to reproduce only Lutheran works which had been printed in English, and these only to the year 1854 (the year before the controversy over the Definite Synodical Platform). Original copies of such works were located in several repositories: Library of Congress, New York Historical Society, Pennsylvania Historical Society, New York Public Library, Huntington Library in San Marino, Cal., Union Theological Seminary Library, and the private library of Martin Graebner.

Apart entirely from the merits of the thesis which led to the assembling and microfilming of the printed materials in question (and that thesis must be regarded as dubious), the project has brought together valuable sources which were before scattered. Only two Lutheran libraries (in Gettysburg and Philadelphia) can boast of the possession of most of the original items. Not only have these items now been made

accessible to investigators at the University of Chicago, but copies of the microfilm corpus have also been purchased by the libraries of the following institutions, where they may be consulted:

Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Ill.

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul.

Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Calif.

Southern Baptist Historical Society, Louisville, Ky.

Union Theological Seminary, New York.

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.

Unit I of the microfilm corpus, whose contents are listed below, has now been completed (and may still be secured by subscription at $25).

ROLL 1: BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS, 1704-1801

Eric Tobias Björk, *A Little Olive Leaf . . .* (New York, 1704).

Jochum Melchior Magens, *The Articles of Faith . . . by Magister Petrus Sacharia Nakskow . . . , translated into English* (New York, 1754).

J. A. Weygand, *Augsburg Confession* (1755).

Israel Acrelius, *A Sermon, Explaining the Duties of Christian Subjects to their Sovereign . . .* (Philadelphia, 1756).

Richard Peters, *A Sermon, Preached in the New Lutheran Church of Zion, in the City of Philadelphia . . .* (Philadelphia, 1769).

John Christopher Kunze, *The Rudiments of the Shorter Catechism of Dr. Martin Luther* (Philadelphia, 1785).

John Frederick Ernst (?), *Hymns of Praise . . .* (Hudson, N. Y., 1792).

John C. Kunze, *Hymn and Prayer Book . . .* (New York, 1795).

Lawrence van Buskirk, *Six Sermons . . .* (New York, 1797).

George Strebeck, *A Sermon Preached in the German Reformed Church at New York* (New York, 1796).

John C. Kunze, *King Solomon's Great Sacrifice . . .* (New York, 1801).

John Frederick Ernst, *A Sermon, Delivered Before the Civil and Military Officers, the Members of Franklin and St. Paul's Lodges . . .* (Cooperstown, N. Y., 1800).

J. H. C. Helmuth, *Short Account of the Yellow Fever in Philadelphia . . .* (Philadelphia, 1794).

ROLLS 2 & 3: PERIODICALS

The Evangelical Lutheran Intelligencer, Vols. I-IV (Frederick, Md., 1826-31).

The Lutheran Magazine, Vols. I-III (Schoharie, N. Y., 1827-30).

The Lutheran Pulpit and Monthly Religious Magazine, Vols. I, II (Albany, N. Y., 1837-38).

The Lutheran Preacher and Pastoral Messenger, Vols. I, II (Winchester, Va., 1833-35).

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

Index to Religious Periodical Literature, an Author and Subject Index to Periodical Literature, 1949-1952, including an Author Index to Book Reviews. Prepared by Libraries of the American Theological Library Association and compiled and edited by J. Stillson Judah with the assistance of Leslie Joan Ziegler. American Theological Library Association, 1953. (Distributed by The American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Illinois.) ix, 220 pages. $5.00 paper, $6.00 cloth.

An index by author and subject, with cross references, to thirty-one scholarly periodicals not included in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature* or the *International Index to Periodicals*, in the fields of Bible, Theology, Church History, and related disciplines, covering the years 1949-1952, together with an index to book reviews appearing in these periodicals. The resources indexed may be suggested by the following: 83 entries found under Dead Sea Scrolls, 41 under Church and State, 27 under Lord's Supper, 15 under Karl Barth, 27 under Reinhold Niebuhr, 55 under Communism, 32 under the World Council of Churches, and 15 under Missions (plus 19 cross references to related topics). The Index locates critical reviews for approximately 2,000 books, *viz.*, nine titles by Oscar Cullmann are covered by 21 reviews, and seven titles by H. H. Rowley are covered by 30 reviews, etc. It is expected that succeeding volumes of the *Index* will be issued in the future. THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY is among the periodicals indexed.

RAYMOND P. MORRIS

In His Name. The Doctrine of The Trinity in Contemporary Theology. By Claude Welch. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952. 313 pages. $3.50.

The author introduces the doctrine of the Trinity by giving the reader a thorough survey of its historical place in theology, especially since the 19th century. It was during this century that the abandonment of the literal and final authority of Scriptures, as advocated by many of the 19th century theologians, pulled the props from under the traditional statement of trinitarian doctrine.

The author then discusses the position of a number of key theologians. Schleiermacher saw no essential value in the doctrine relative to the Christian faith, while Hegel, according to his disciples, gave the doctrine a new intellectual form superior to the form of faith. In Ritschl's theology of "value judgment" there was little room for a trinitarian doctrine. Liberalistic and Unitarian influence, both in England and America, also affected the doctrine in the 19th century.

The "Erlangen school" set out to re-examine the doctrine in the light of the historical actuality of Jesus Christ. But the reorientation in theology thus inaugurated was more than a protest against liberalism. Rather it was a re-emphasis on the central elements of the Christian faith. Gradually the trinitarian question emerged into the foreground of the "doctrine of God," so that today again "the doctrine is an arche, a first principle, of all Christian thought and life." It is this positive and constructive emphasis throughout the book that, in the opinion of this reviewer, makes this volume a valuable contribution to this doctrine.

Practically every major modern author is discussed and evaluated. At times it is a bit confusing to keep in mind the different schools as these different names appear in new settings. An over-emphasis on minute details here and there obscures the author's positive approach.

The reviewer is a bit confused by the author's treatment of Brunner. He points out that to Brunner this doctrine is a *Schutz-*

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

lehre, or "defensive doctrine." It is not the biblical *kerygma,* hence not the *kerygma* of the church. The author points out that Brunner wants to distinguish between "revelation of" and "reflection on" this doctrine. But he also recognizes that Brunner does not attack belief in the basic transcendent Trinity, but the theological road to its formation. There is something of Luther's *deus absconditus* in Brunner's approach. It might be questioned whether, as the author suggests, Brunner's approach implies that "God-in-Himself" might actually be other than "God-in-revelation." With Brunner also this remains a "dialectic" problem, not fully grasped even in the "Word Incarnate."

All of Part Two continues to deal with various individual emphases. As a whole the author regards these doctrinal approaches as "synthetic" attempts to make the doctrine "a kind of defensive doctrine" (p. 160).

In Part Three the author turns more definitely to his own basic interpretation. To prove sound the claims that this doctrine is "the very center of the whole faith" he suggests the approach by way of "analysis" rather than "synthesis." "Analysis," he contends, "is the immediate implication of revelation," and "therefore essentially identical with the content of revelation" (p. 162). In this emphasis Dr. Welch follows Karl Barth, the Trinity being fundamental to all other questions of faith. The Bible testifies to a revelation in which God comes to man, becomes man. This is always a fact, an action. Welch follows Barth in speaking of the doctrine of the Trinity as an "analysis" of revelation, without defining the use of the word analysis. The basic emphasis here is that in revelation we have to do with God himself and not (according to all Modernism) with an entity apart from himself. Thus the "Spirit is holy *in us*" because he is antecedently so in himself. In other words God cannot *not* be God. The *deus absconditus* is always also the *deus revelatus,* even though we may not comprehend him fully.

Barth also, Welch points out, struggles with vocabulary. In the doctrine of "coinherence" or *perichoresis* he (Barth) sees the "dialectic of unity and trinity" (p. 188). It might well be asked here whether the concept of the *perichoresis* does not merely add another problem to the doctrine of the Trinity. Barth further contends that the term person is not adequate, though traditionally useful, and he suggests as a preferable expression "modes of being" (*Seinsweisen*). God is a threefold repetition. "It is not, properly speaking, the modes of existence which subsist, but God who subsists in three modes of existence" (p. 198). Welch regards Barth's emphasis as significant for two reasons: (1) There is a single basis of doctrine, the whole witness of Scripture. In the judgment of the reviewer this emphasis in Barth reflects somewhat a Calvinistic bibliolatry, rather than the existential concept of revelation. (2) Barth's approach points back to God's "internal" or "original" relation in his eternal modes of existence.

In Part Four Welch comes to his own emphasis in what he calls a constructive statement. He emphasizes strongly the need and place of the doctrine in Christian theology. In his "Trinitarian Reconstruction" he follows Barth closely with some minor modifications.

A few direct quotations will best illustrate Welch's position, a position which this reviewer finds healthy and encouraging for our generation.

"It is no longer possible to accept the easy attitude that the doctrine is of only antiquarian and historical interest or that it is simply the product of a speculative philosophy foreign alike to the modern mind and the central interests of the gospel" (218). While Welch would not subscribe to traditional orthodoxy he almost takes refuge in its language. "The act of God in Christ *is* his love. The revelation of his *redeeming love* is for Christians inseparable from his revelation of himself as Father, Son and Holy Spirit" (p. 222). It gives expression to the "structure" of God rather than types of action (p. 224). The "economic" Trinity is therefore only the revelation of the "immanent" Trinity.

The doctrine, Welch goes on, is more than a synthesis or harmonization of various elements of revelation. "Instead of calling it a 'synthesized formula' which combines these elements, however, it would be better to say that the doctrine of the Trinity expresses the inseparability and essential unity of these

elements" (p. 228). At this point Welch returns to the idea that the doctrine is an analysis of what is directly involved in the revelation which the New Testament attests, i.e., a witness to one divine act.

The affirmation of *homo-ousios* was the historic rejection of all subordinationism, Welch points out. It is not the affirmation of a mere singularity in isolation, but a unity of variety, God in three personae or hypostases.

Welch regards the doctrine as a primary "affirmation of faith," and an "immediate explication of the fact that God has revealed himself to us in Jesus Christ." "This view," he continues, "makes intelligible and necessary the claim that the Trinity is the final and all-inclusive doctrine, the supreme principle, the very center of the whole faith" (p. 238).

The doctrine of the Trinity expresses the reality of God's self-differentiation as Father, Son and Spirit. "The Unity of God is not the bare undifferentiated unity of utter simplicity; it is a unity of variety or manifoldness . . . that . . . implies a communion or communitiness of the Father and the Son in the Spirit" (p. 239 f.). The consistent emphasis on the importance of the doctrine is a welcome one. Says Welch: "Trinitarianism is not an inductive conclusion from *scientia,* but an *arche,* a presupposition of thought which is given to men in the new *logos* in Christ" (p. 245). Here, this reviewer feels, Welch is approaching to true meaning of revelation.

Welch in his "reconstruction" approach, like all theologians, struggles with the term "person" as applied to the Trinity. He does not deny the personal in the Trinity. We must always insist, says Welch, that God is in every respect personal. "The hypostases are not less personal than the essence. God is always . . . "He" rather than "It" (p. 271). The modern usage of the theological term "person" does present difficulties. However, it might be well to remember here that vocabulary was also a problem to Augustine, and will be to every discerning theologian. Any term used must eventually prove inadequate for the eternal truth. God is not reducible to formula. Says Welch: "Our concern here, therefore, must be seen in proper perspective, as the desirability of having a relatively exact term which can serve both the negative function of excluding false meanings and the positive function of pointing to the kind of distinctions we apprehend in Father, Son and Holy Spirit" (p. 276).

In search of adequate language in which to clothe this doctrine, the author is persuaded that the most useful term for our purpose is "modes of being" (or modes of existence), suggestive of Barth's "Seinsweisen." By this he means not simply "ways of God's being in relation to man, but God's ways of being God" (p. 277). In this, the author claims, is preserved the genuine continuity of "meaning as expressed in the traditional formulation." Or as Welch continues: "When we speak of God—the One Being, Essence, Personality—subsisting in three modes of being, or of threefold self-determination, we do not refer merely to a Personality which expresses itself in a threefold manner. We mean that God's being is constituted in and by threeness; this is the "structure" of his being; he is personal in this way, i.e., his trinity constitutes his personality" (p. 278-9).

Here one might well ask whether this vocabulary is an improvement on some of the traditional orthodox language or approach inasmuch as the term "modes" (of being) also suggests definite historical implications. The author himself admits that "all our language about God is at best analogical."

The reviewer considers this volume one of the finest contemporary treatments of the doctrine of the Trinity. It is not satisfied with a thorough historical review, but offers some sound constructive suggestions to the study of this basic doctrine. To any student who is deeply concerned with the problem this book is a must.

JAMES J. RAUN

Kerygma und Mythos. Ein theologisches Gespräch. Edited by Hans-Werner Bartsch. Hamburg: Herbert Reich. Volume I, 2nd edition, 1951. 219 pages. Volume II, 1952. 211 pages.

The central position which the program of Rudolf Bultmann holds in theological dis-

cussion in Germany has become apparent again in this two-volume publication, which contains Bultmann's original essay on *Neues Testament und Mythologie* and twenty contributions to the discussion of Bultmann's view. The collection is concluded with a comprehensive answer of Bultmann to all the contributors.

Since Bultmann's program has been described in a recent issue of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY (Vol. V, No. 4, November, 1953), we shall present here a brief review of the discussion of his thesis. The contributors may be divided into three groups: decided and even enthusiastic followers of Bultmann, friendly critics, and definite opponents. The last-mentioned group could have been larger but for the principle stated in the preface that only such contributions have been selected which acknowledge that Bultmann's statement of the problem is a burning issue. Thus, for instance, Herman Sasse's *Flucht vor'm Dogma* has not been included since it denies the whole problem with the statement that "the New Testament doesn't need to be demythologized because it contains no myth." To the reviewer this is a serious lack, because the right wing of the conservative opposition to Bultmann should not have been excluded from the discussion.

These two volumes make fascinating reading. One has the feeling of quietly listening to a discussion of the most fundamental problems of exegetical method and of theological thought which is carried out with deep honesty and a personal commitment which not only traces theological thinking but reveals personal attitudes and basic positions over against the essential problems of the Christian faith. It is amazing to see to what extent Bultmann's challenge causes a re-defining of the fundamentals of exegetical and theological thought.

The approach of most contributors, and especially of Bultmann himself, is highly theoretical and intellectual, sometimes even indulging in a certain German inclination toward over-subtleties which will not be too well appreciated by American readers. Nevertheless, the basic concern in the whole discussion is a practical one: how can we preach the Gospel in such a way that it can be understood by modern man? This leads to a close examination of the concepts of myth and history, of objective and subjective elements in the Christian faith, of the relation between theology and philosophy or between theology and science, of the real meaning of eschatology.

As the discussion goes on, it becomes more and more apparent that the crucial problem in the whole issue is the problem of *Heilsgeschichte*. Is Bultmann right in claiming that the New Testament message doesn't want to present an objective history which must be accepted, but wants to present, in the garment of mythology, a view of human existence? Or does our faith need an objective historical foundation? A major difficulty lies in the fact that Bultmann himself is not absolutely clear and consistent on this point but, while denying a history of salvation, still postulates a salvatory event (*Heilsgeschehen*). For this reason, one of the contributors (F. Buri) even accuses him of a remnant of reactionary orthodoxy and recommends not a demythologizing but a dekerygmatizing of the Christian message, *i.e.*, to dissociate it entirely from the historical fact of the cross and resurrection of Jesus.

But that is an isolated view. The majority of the contributors who are not followers of Bultmann argue against him from the standpoint of *Heilsgeschichte* and of an objective foundation for our faith.

It is very refreshing to observe the spirit of fairness in which the whole discussion is carried on, though one feels that it arouses the deepest emotions and anxieties of the participants. The honest and constructive *intention* of Bultmann is acknowledged by all contributors, even by those who are convinced that the effect of his teaching is destructive. Bultmann's answer is also written in a quiet and fair tone.

On the whole, one gets the impression that Bultmann's challenge has had an awakening and rallying effect. The essentials of our faith have become clearer to many thinkers just because they are under attack. It might not be hard to predict where the majority of the readers of the QUARTERLY would take their stand in this matter. But as one follows the discussion one feels that these problems cannot be ignored, because our general thinking has, since the 17th century, under-

gone such deep changes that our basic views of the Bible and its significance for the Christian life, though essentially valid, need re-thinking and re-defining. The way this is attempted in the volumes under review shows that in matters of faith a free and fair colloquy is always the best line of progress.

PAUL LEO

Leiturgia. Handbuch des evangelischen Gottesdienstes. Edited by Karl Ferdinand Müller und Walter Blankenburg. Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1952-53. Vol. I. DM 36.

This three-volume work of approximately 1,500 pages promises to be the most comprehensive and important discussion of all aspects of Christian worship that has appeared in Germany for fifty years. It is broader in scope and treatment than was Professor Georg Rietschel's standard two-volume *Lehrbuch der Liturgik* of 1900-1901. Eminent Protestant theologians, historians, liturgical scholars, and musicians are responsible for its several sections.

The publishers remind us that historical research, critical analysis, and constructive thinking during the past twenty years in the fields of theology, Luther study, life of the early church, liturgics, and church music have yielded results of great importance. Enlisting the aid of recognized specialists, they have projected a work which will summarize the fruits of this endeavor.

With the appearance of the sixth section (*Lieferung*) the first volume is now complete. This permits a review of the work so far published and an announcement of the material yet to come. The first volume deals with the history, theology, and liturgical forms of the Service (*Hauptgottesdienst*), and Matins and Vespers as well. The second volume, which will be the last to appear from the press, will discuss Baptism, Confirmation, Confession, Marriage, and other occasional services. The third volume will treat the music of the church with special reference to liturgical principles involved.

The first section of Volume I reviews the entire history of Christian worship and discusses current liturgical movements. This discussion by Rudolf Stählin covers eighty pages and is a marvel of crisp and scholarly condensation. The treatment throughout is discriminating and fair. The proportion and balance of material must be questioned. Generous space is given the early church, the medieval church, the Reformation, and the Roman Church since the Reformation. The studies and fruitful reforms and restorations of Lutheran worship in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Germany and elsewhere are passed over too lightly. Liturgical developments in Sweden are given a scant two pages. The whole scholarship and far-reaching results of the liturgical revival in the Church of England receive only brief notice. There is no appreciation of the great impact which this had upon the English-speaking world. As for efforts in this field in the Lutheran Church in America, the only reference in this first volume under review is found in fourteen lines of type on page 80. American Lutherans will note with interest that in even this brief reference Dr. Stählin speaks approvingly of the new Service Book and Hymnal now in preparation, noting particularly the fact that the Lutherans in America have been able to agree upon the reintroduction of a Eucharistic Prayer, an accomplishment which, as he says, the Lutheran Liturgical Conference in Germany "unfortunately has not been able to effect."

The second section contains a relatively lengthy article of 187 pages. It leads into an exhaustive and original discussion of the theory of worship. The need of an adequate treatment of this subject from a Lutheran point of view has long been recognized. Prof. Brunner's learned discussion will be welcomed by scholars, though upon first reading the complexity and subtlety of the material presented are disturbing. There is, first, an impressive survey of the literature, though few but German sources are listed. An important feature is the inclusion of important periodical and pamphlet material. The literary output of the last half-century is critically appraised. The discussion itself is able, original, and extremely involved, philosophical analysis slicing the material very thin in countless divisions and subdivisions. Occasionally the discussion seems to enter the realm of fancy. Excursions into the fields of anthropology and cosmology

lead to descriptions of the worship of all created things in nature and the worship of angels. The worship of the Christian congregation is located somewhere between these two. The importance of "form" in worship is fully treated—its necessity, its limits, its relevance to history and art, etc. The sacramental and the sacrificial elements in formal worship are adequately described.

We may merely mention titles and authors of the remaining sections of Volume I: Church Architecture by Gerhard Langmaack in 66 pages, with many floor plans in the text; and the Church Year by Gerhard Kunze in an article of 97 pages.

As a collection of scholarly treatises by various specialists there is considerable duplication of material. The major criticism of the work, however, has already been indicated. Notwithstanding its massive scope and scholarship, it is primarily a work by Germans for Germans. There is scant recognition of even major contributions of reputable scholars in many other lands—England, Sweden, Scotland, France, Italy, or America —though the literature of the subjects treated is extensive. The bibliographies imbedded in every section of *Leitur*gia are practically limited to German authors. Dr. Stählin, for example, lists 51 books and articles. Of these 47 are German titles. Dr. Brunner lists 158 titles. No less than 149 of these are by German authors. Only 5 are French, 3 English, and 1 Swedish.

Within its self-imposed limits, *Leitur*gia is a major work. Scholars who wish to know what a very important part of Protestantism has thought and done about this subject will have to read this book. Its format, typography, etc., are excellent and in keeping with its material. The appearance of the two remaining volumes will be eagerly awaited.

LUTHER D. REED

Biskopstillsättningen i Sverige. By Sven Kjöllerström. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1952. 248 pages. Kr. 20.

This exhaustive historical dissertation is a presentation of the procedure of appointing bishops in Sweden from 1531 to the present time. It is well known that the line of bishops in the Swedish Church was not broken by the Reformation. In 1531 Laurentius Petri became the first Lutheran archbishop in Sweden. The relationship between church and state has played an important part in the appointment of bishops. This was especially the case before 1866 while the clergy constituted one of the estates in the *Riksdag*.

Since they were in a position to exert a strong political influence, the choice of bishops was of considerable concern to the government. But it was also of concern to the church in preserving autonomy over against domination by the state. Efforts in that direction were not lacking, but there were strong churchmen to guard the independence of the church.

The procedure in the election of a bishop involved three steps: *nominatio, confirmatio,* and *consecratio*. Details of procedure varied through the centuries. Nomination was made by vote of the clergy within the diocese, three candidates usually being placed in nomination. Since the bishops exercised supervision over the educational institutions, the latter also had a voice in the election. From among those nominated the king selected one, whose election he confirmed.

The consecration was performed either by the archbishop or by some bishop acting in his place. Occasions were not lacking when the prerogatives of the crown were pressed too far, and again there were prelates who were more concerned for their political prestige than for the welfare of the church.

Originally laymen had a voice in the choice of a bishop (*clerus et populus*), but gradually this function was reserved for the clergy or the consistory. Many proposals for change have been made, but with only moderate success. More recent proposals would give laymen a share in the election of bishops. These proposals are in line with democratic trends generally, and with the desire that laymen should assume a larger share in the work of the church. A proposal that the office of bishop be discontinued has received little support. To some extent the General Church Assembly, instituted in 1866, accorded laymen a voice in the decisions of the church, but this did not include the choice of bishops. The "great faculty" of Lund was strongly opposed to giving laymen a voice

in episcopal elections, while free-church elements favored it. P. Waldenström was a powerful advocate of the change.

It was argued in its favor that by a direct share in the choice of a bishop the laity of the church would feel a greater sense of responsibility in the work of the church. While those who opposed lay participation in elections admitted the right and duty of laymen to share in the work of the church on the lower levels, they contended that the laity was not in a position to know who were best qualified for the office of bishop. The office of bishop was regarded as a spiritual office, in the appointment to which only the clergy should have a voice. In principle it was generally admitted that the Lutheran doctrine of the church gave the laity full right to share in its functions. The diocese of Gothenburg declared that "the participation of laymen in the election of a bishop is a move in line with the current development in the church which calls for an increasing activity in the life of the church" and is a return to an earlier practice. On the other hand, there was no urgent demand on the part of the laity for such participation. The relationship of the church to the state presented many practical difficulties which might involve further secularization of the church.

The prolonged debate on the question did not lead to any significant change in the traditional practice. While laymen in other Scandinavian churches have a share in the election of bishops, the Church of Sweden is the only one in which laymen, with the exception of lay members of the cathedral chapters, are deprived of this privilege.

OSCAR N. OLSON

Lutherischer Glaube im Denken der Gegenwart. By Erich Klamroth. Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1954. 162 pages.

This book is difficult to appraise. The title seems to point to a sort of a modern dogmatics written from the Lutheran point of view. But in the opening sentence the author disavows such a claim. Instead, he says, he purposes to delineate only the mode of Lutheran thinking. Denominational differences, he goes on to say, are not something arbitrary and unrelated, but are of necessity the result of a fundamentally different approach to the Christian dogma. The Lutheran understanding of faith stems from the maxim, "The infinite is capable of the finite." While this starting point is sound, the development of the theme left us somewhat in a quandary. The book is more philosophical than theological. Much of the space is taken up with citations from writers (mostly modern Germans) who are not in agreement with the Gospel, so that by comparison the constructive part of the book comes off rather badly. Whether or not this volume will appeal to the German theologians we are not qualified to decide; on this side of the Atlantic, however, we are sure that not many of us will regard the volume as a valuable contribution to Lutheran theology.

OTTO W. HEICK

Christian Stewardship and Church Finance. By H. W. Ellis. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1953. 153 pages. $2.00.

The character of this book is not entirely covered by its title which might well suggest that it was a manual of methods. Rather is it an earnest setting forth of the fact that "success in church finance is to be fully realized only when there shall come into the hearts of God's people an abiding conviction that giving is a priceless privilege, a sacred obligation, and an act of acceptable worship. . . ."

In its favor may be noted that it leans heavily upon the Scriptures, quoting innumerable passages and texts, that each chapter is carefully outlined, and that the chapters are closely linked in progressive development of the underlying argument. Its tithing emphasis gears into the increased interest in that practice that marks present day church life.

Less in its favor are the rhapsodic and oratorical style of an earlier day and its unrelenting hortatory character. It is evident that the author is a man of deepest conviction and sincerity but there remains a feeling that there is a measure of verbosity if not repetitiousness. It may, however, be read with assured profit.

HENRY H. BAGGER

Books Received

J. N. D. Anderson, *The World's Religions,* Eerdmans, 1953.
Karl Barth, *Against the Stream,* Philosophical Library, 1954.
Herman Bavinck, *The Philosophy of Revelation,* Eerdmans, 1953.
Nicolas Berdyaev, *Truth and Revelation,* Harper, 1953.
Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Prisoner for God,* Macmillan, 1954.
J. S. Bonnell, *The Practice and Power of Prayer,* Westminster, 1954.
F. W. Brink, *God Speaks,* Westminster, 1954.
N. O. Brown, *Hesiod's Theogony,* Liberal Arts Press, 1953.
W. L. Curry, *Anthems for the Junior Choir III,* Westminster, 1954.
Eric Crozier, *Noah Gives Thanks,* Seabury Press, 1953.
Vergilius Ferm, ed., *Puritan Sage,* Library Publishers, 1953.
Friedr. Gogarten, *Verhängnis und Hoffnung der Zeit,* Vorwerk, 1953.
F. C. Grant, ed., *Hellenistic Religions,* Liberal Arts Press, 1953.
Georgia Harkness, *Be Still and Know,* Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953.
Seward Hiltner, *Sex, Ethics and the Kinsey Reports,* Association, 1953.
W. Hubatsch, *Europäische Briefe im Reformationszeitalter,* Holzner, 1949.
C. Jaarsma, *Fundamentals in Christian Education,* Eerdmans, 1953.
R. F. Johnston, *The Development of Negro Religion,* Philosophical Library, 1954.
T. A. Kantonen, *Theology of Evangelism,* Muhlenberg, 1954.
W. L. King, *Introduction to Religion,* Harper, 1954.
H. H. Kroll, *The Long Quest,* Westminster, 1954.
E. L. Long, *Conscience and Compromise,* Westminster, 1954.
Laura Long, *Queen Esther,* Association, 1954.
D. G. Miller, *Fire in Thy Mouth,* Westminster, 1954.
V. G. Millikin, *Jeremiah, Prophet of Disaster,* Association, 1954.
D. T. Niles, *Preaching the Gospel of the Resurrection,* Westminster, 1954.
A. C. Outler, *Psychotherapy and the Christian Message,* Harper, 1954.
J. B. Phillips, *The Gospels,* Macmillan, 1953.
Helen Pfatteicher, *In Every Corner Sing,* Muhlenberg, 1954.
Otto Samuel, *A Foundation of Ontology,* Philosophical Library, 1953.
Calvin Schnucker, *How to Plan the Rural Church Program,* Westminster, 1954.
D. W. Soper, ed., *Highways to Faith,* Westminster, 1954.
M. C. Tenney, *The New Testament,* Eerdmans, 1953.
Rolf Thomassen, *Beyond Today,* Augsburg, 1953.
E. J. Trueblood, *The Dawn of the Post-Modern Era,* Philosophical Library, 1953.
Geerhardus Vos, *The Self Disclosure of Jesus,* Eerdmans, 1953.
A. N. Williams, *Paul, the World's First Missionary,* Association, 1954.